

B10
B32

UC-NRLF



B 4 506 469

YD 08664

YD 08664

HISTORY

ITS RISE AND DEVELOPMENT

A Survey of the Progress of Historical Writing from Its
Origins to the Present Day

BY

HARRY ELMER BARNES, Ph.D.

Associate Professor of History, Clark College,
Clark University, Worcester, Mass.

UNIVERSITY OF
CALIFORNIA

REPRINTED FROM THE 1919 EDITION OF
THE ENCYCLOPEDIA AMERICANA

B 30

Gift of Prof. Barnes

NO. MMU
MURCHISON

HISCOCK, Frank, American legislator: b. Pompey, Onondaga County, N. Y., 6 Sept. 1834; d. 18 June 1914. In 1855 he was admitted to the bar, in 1860-63 was district attorney of Onondaga County, and in 1867 a member of the State constitutional convention of New York. He was a Republican representative in Congress in 1879-87, and obtained recognition as a party leader and speaker. In 1887-93 he was United States senator from New York and chairman of the appropriations committee, and then returned to professional practice.

HISPANIA, his-pá-ni-a. See SPAIN.

HISSAR, one of the mailed catfishes of northern South America, noted for its monogamous habits, and the fact the eggs, a few at a time, are voided by the female into a pouch made by the folded membranes of her ventral fins. Here they are fertilized by the male, and then are taken by the faithful pair to a secluded place and deposited. This operation is repeated until about 250 eggs are placed in the nest which is then guarded. The hissar and several other species belong to the genus *Callichthys*.

HISTOLOGY, the science of animal and vegetable tissues. It investigates by means of the microscope the various tissues of man, animals and plants in their anatomical relations and compositions. Topographical histology considers the more minute structures of the organs and systems of the body; normal histology deals with the healthy tissues; and pathological histology investigates the changes they undergo in disease. Marie François Xavier Bichat (1771-1802) is generally credited with the foundation of the science of histology. Unfortunately the imperfect condition of the microscope in his time prevented Bichat and his contemporaries from carrying their investigations to the point which Schleiden, Schwann, Johann Müller, Virchow, Von Recklinghausen, Cohnheim, etc., have reached. It has been found that all structures however complex are made up of cells, and that the parts of a body may be resolved into a small number of elementary tissues now grouped as: (1) epithelium, which lines almost all the cavities of the body and is directly or indirectly in communication with the atmosphere; (2) the nervous tissues, which as nerve cells originate and as nervous fibres transmit all nervous impulses; (3) muscle, which produces motion whether voluntary or involuntary; (4) glandular tissue which consists of cells standing in close relation with the blood-vessels which take from the blood certain substances and secrete them; (5) connective substances which support and hold together the more delicate and important structures, especially forming the cartilages and bones. See PLANTS, STRUCTURE OF.

Many tissues have the power of repairing injuries that happen to them. This power is called regeneration, and is found especially in the lower animals, in polyps, worms and in many amphibious creatures and reptiles. In other cases the lesion is supplied by a new growth of connective substance. In diseases the tissues undergo many changes and many of these diseases in the organism are shown also by the changing of color. The science of such changes is generally called pathological histology. It is a comparatively young science

and has been cultivated by Virchow, who was the founder of cellular pathology.

Vegetable histology is that department of botany which deals with microscopic phytotomy or the anatomy of plants, especially investigating the plant cells and plant tissues. It is properly subordinate to morphology and is a distinctively descriptive science. It deals with the question in what relation the cells or forms of tissue stand to the vital activity of plants, what functions they perform, and in what respect they are constituted for the fulfilling of those functions. (Compare CYTOLOGY). Owing to the excessive minuteness of the cells which form the tissues of all plants the investigation relies almost entirely on the microscope, and naturally has made its advance in proportion as the microscope has been made more perfect. Microscopes that are now used magnify at least 1,000 diameters, and the materials used have to be carefully prepared and mounted. Many of them have to be colored with haematoxylin, fuchsin, saffranin, and other alcoholic or aqueous dyes. Consult Bailey, F. R., 'Text-Book of Histology' (4th ed., New York 1913); Chamberlain, C. J., 'Methods in Plant Histology' (2d ed., Chicago 1905); Lee, A. B., 'Microtomist's Vade-mecum' (6th ed., Philadelphia 1905); Strasburger, E., 'Handbook of Practical Botany' (7th ed., New York 1911); Delafield and Prudden, 'Handbook of Pathological Anatomy and Histology' (9th ed., New York 1911).

HISTORICAL DETERMINISM. See DETERMINISM.

HISTORICAL GEOLOGY, that branch of the subject that deals with the orderly treatment of the events of the past, chronologically, and with due regard to cause and effect. It includes Palaeontology (q.v.) and Stratigraphy (q.v.). See section on Stratigraphy in the article on GEOLOGY. See also PALEOZOIC, CAMBRIAN, CARBONIFEROUS, etc.

HISTORICAL SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS. See ECONOMICS.

HISTORY, ITS RISE AND DEVELOPMENT: A Survey of the Progress of Historical Writing from its Origins to the Present Day.

I. THE NATURE OF HISTORY.

1. Meaning of the Term.—The term *History*, in popular usage, has been applied to two somewhat different concepts. It is often used to designate the sum total of human activities, and it is when used in this sense that one often hears the remark at a particularly active or critical period in human events that "now history is being made." A more common usage is that which regards history as the record of the events rather than as the events themselves. In this latter generally accepted connotation given to the term *history*, two definitions may be offered. In an objective sense history is, to use the words of Professor Robinson, "all we know about everything man has ever done, or thought, or hoped, or felt." Subjectively or psychologically expressed, history may be regarded as a record of all that has occurred within the realm of human consciousness.

In this sense of a record of the acts of the human race history has been reg-

by some, particularly in earlier periods, as primarily an art—a branch of literature. By a continually increasing number of authorities it has tended, however, in its modern form, to be considered as in the main a genetic social science, which is concerned with reconstructing the past thoughts and activities of humanity. In the present article history will be regarded in the sense of a science rather than as an art. It is the thesis of the writer that history can lay no more claim to being an art than any other branch of social science and that while artistic achievement may be desired in history it is quite subordinate in importance to scientific accuracy and constructive thought. In fact, progress in historical writing may almost be regarded as a development from an art to a science. It is this which constitutes the progress from Livy to Ranke or from Herodotus to Gardiner.

2. Fallacy of the Term Pre-historic.—Before the important developments in anthropology and pre-historic archaeology, which have done so much to extend our knowledge of human activities in the distant past, it was the conventional practice to limit the term history to a record of those events which were described or preserved in literary remains. Now, however, when archaeology tells one much more of certain phases of the early life of man than was once known of even more recent periods through literary evidence, it is no longer accurate nor logical to use the term "pre-historic," unless it is employed to designate that vague and hypothetical period in the beginnings of human development of which there exists no positive and tangible record, or unless one is limiting his conception of history as a branch of literature. In the place of the now generally discarded and discredited term "pre-historic" there has been substituted the concept of "pre-literary history," as descriptive of the records of that period of human development where the information is revealed by archaeological rather than literary evidence. In short, it has been agreed that a fundamental fallacy and contradiction is involved in the use of the term "pre-historic" for any period of which there is any considerable record preserved, whether in writing or in the artifacts of daily life. With recent writers "pre-historic" has followed the term "pre-Adamite" into that oblivion of discarded categories which is being continually expanded as an inevitable result of the growth of the knowledge of human activities in both time and space.

It has been deemed inadvisable at this point in the article to discuss the various interpretations of what history means or should be mainly concerned with narrating. It is in great part the task of this whole article to reveal the diverse interpretations of history, and this much debated problem of what history means or has been thought to mean will be shown in historical mutations and transformations.

I THE ESSENTIAL PRELIMINARIES TO THE ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF HISTORY.

1. Archaeology as the "Threshold" of History—Pre-literary History.—Having seen that history in the modern sense of the term "goes back to the beginnings of any record of past life and action," we may inquire into the ultimate origin of history in man.

artifacts which were sufficiently distinctive in form and durable in material composition to have been preserved through the ages as evidence of what mankind was accomplishing in the vast expanse of time before the art of writing was mastered. History, thus, may probably be said to have had its real origin in the disputed eolithic period, and the first historical document may be accurately held to have been the first indisputable colith, or if the eolithic period be denied, the first definite paleolith of the river drift period.

Space does not here allow even the briefest résumé of that most interesting story of the early development of mankind as revealed by the artifacts which have been preserved. The thrilling evidences of man's interests and activities in that almost immeasurable period of a quarter of a million years which are revealed by the "coup de poings" of the river drift period, the remarkable flaked flints of the cave period, as well as the engraving on animal bones and the early paintings from such sites as Altamira and Font-de-Gaume and the wonderful products of the bronze and iron ages, are all subjects of the most compelling interest, for the complete treatment of which the reader must be referred to the article on "Archaeology." Suffice it to say at this point that these archaeological products of the pre-literary period mark the real threshold of history.

Nor can one, in the space, allotted to this article, do more than to refer to the origin in modern times of the science of pre-historic archaeology, so inextricably connected with the work of such men as Boucher de Perthes, Sir John Evans, de Mortillet, Rivot, Dechêlette, Cartailhac, Breuil, Schmidt, Obermaier, Montelius, Peet, Schliemann and Sir Arthur Evans, and which has rediscovered what is, from the standpoint of the time which elapsed, the greater portion of human history. Even less can be said concerning the work of geologists like Lyell, Le Conte, Winchell, Sollas, Geikie, Penck and Chamberlain; of biologists such as Darwin, Wallace, Huxley and Haeckel; and of anthropologists of the type of Tylor, Avelbury, McLennan, Morgan and their more critical successors, all of whom have reconstructed the prevailing notions of the origin of the human race, of chronology and the eras of human development earlier fixed by Julius Africanus, Eusebius, and Jerome, and have made it possible for the present generation to interpret the real significance of the archaeological remains, rather than being compelled to view them in the manner of earlier generations as "thunder stones," or some other object of fancy and superstition.

2. The Mastery of the Art of Writing.—Though the non-literary archaeological remains of early man are of the utmost aid and importance in reconstructing his modes of life and activity, no extensive or ample record of past events was possible until some progress had been made in the way of being able to give uniform objective and permanent expression to human thought and action, in other words, until the art of writing had been mastered.

The obscure origins of the art of writing must be regarded as dating back to the picture writing which first appears on the implements and the cave walls of the middle and later

paleolithic periods. Before these pictograms, however, could be regarded as real writing, it was necessary that they should pass through three well defined stages of development. In the first place, the pictures had to become conventionalized, so that they always had the same appearance and designated the same object. Next, it was necessary that they should not only refer to a concrete object, but also become the symbols of abstract conceptions. Finally, it was essential that the conventionalized symbols should pass into that stage where they combined a representation of an abstract conception and the sound of the human voice. This last stage itself passed through a number of developments. In the simplest, and most elementary form of this "sound writing" each symbol represented an entire word. Some languages, such as the Chinese, have never passed beyond this monosyllabic stage. Normally, however, the symbols usually came to represent not a whole word but a syllable. Sooner or later, the various possible sounds of the human voice were analyzed and came to be represented by separate symbols or letters, and the alphabet thereby came into existence. The first known example of a true alphabet appeared among the Phoenicians about 1000 B.C. Of its origins little is known further than that the Phoenicians borrowed most of these signs from their neighbors in Egypt, Babylonia and Crete. The Phoenician alphabet contained twenty-two consonants and it remained for the Greeks later to perfect the modern alphabet by adding the vowels. There seem to have been at least five independent centres of the origin of writing, namely, Crete, Egypt, Mesopotamia, China and Central America.

Along with the mastery of the art of writing went the provision of materials on which to set down the desired letters and words. Stone columns and walls and even the clay tablets of the Babylonians, whatever their virtues from the standpoint of permanence, were clumsy, awkward and restricted writing materials. The Egyptians solved the difficulty by utilizing the membrane of the papyrus reed. Later, parchment was fashioned from the skin of animals for the use of those peoples where papyrus was not available. Paper, made originally from silk, first appeared among the Chinese about 200 B.C. The Arabs devised a paper made from cotton fibre, about 750 A.D. This was brought into Spain, where flax was substituted for cotton and the modern linen paper came into use about 1250.¹ With the provision of an alphabet and writing materials, historical writing could begin that long course of development which was to bring it from Herodotus and Thucydides to Ranke, Aulard, Gardiner and Osgood. Professor Breasted has well stated the importance of this step in the evolution of civilization in general and of historical writing in particular, "The invention of writing and of a convenient system of records on paper has had a greater influence in uplifting the human race than any other intellectual achievement in the career of man. It was more important than all the battles ever fought and all the constitutions ever devised." Before a true historical perspective could develop, however, it was indispensable that some method of measuring time should be discovered and a scientific system of chronology evolved.

3. The Development of the Conception of Time and the Provision of a Chronology.—Indispensable as some method of measuring time was for chronicling the thoughts and actions of man, it was not for this purpose that the calendar was originally developed. As Professor Shotwell has remarked, and Professor Webster has shown in greater detail, it was the deeds of the gods and not of men that the early calendars were designed to fix and record. The methods of measuring time grew up about the need for determining the dates of tabooed or holy days and for fixing and recording the occurrence of unusual natural phenomena which were believed to have some religious significance. In other words, the concept of time was born with the dawn of the consciousness of the repetition of natural processes and phenomena and the necessity of differentiating between days on the basis of their particular virtue or qualities. The perfection of the methods of measuring time has been a gradual process of transition "from luck to mathematics." It was not until long after crude calendars had been provided for these religious uses that they were utilized to fashion a chronology for recording historic events.

The simplest and most primitive type of calendar was the lunar calendar based on the phases of the moon. The basis was the lunar month of 29 and one-half days. From this it was possible to provide roughly for convenient units of measurement, both longer and shorter than the month. The lunar fortnight was a widespread unit of time, and weeks were secured from the quarters of the moon or from a division of the months into three periods of 10 days each, the latter being closest mathematical solution. Twelve lunar months produced a lunar year of 354 days, and to keep the months synchronized with the seasonal divisions, a thirteenth month was interpolated at appropriate intervals. A longer interval was the lunar cycle of about 19 years, which came into use among the Greeks about 750 B.C. Though the lunar calendar provided no exact divisions of time, either long or short, and was continually getting out of adjustment, it was tolerated and retained by all the peoples of antiquity except the Egyptians, who share with the aboriginal inhabitants of Mexico the honor of having first evolved the solar year and the beginnings of the modern calendar. The agricultural life of the dwellers in the Nile valley and the importance of the Sun-God in Egypt tended to increase the importance of the sun at the expense of the moon. Accordingly, as early as 4241 B.C., the earliest fixed date in history, the Egyptians had devised a solar year of 365 days, with 12 months of 30 days each and five feast days at the end of each year. The seven-day week of the modern calendar, cutting through both month and year, was the product of the ingenuity and religious arrangements of the Hebrews. As early as 238 B.C. Alexandrian scientists had devised the quadrennial leap year, and during the Hellenistic period the Hebrew week was adapted to form the planetary week of the modern calendar. In 46 B.C. Julius Caesar prescribed for the Roman world this solar year, but the planetary week did not come into general use in Rome before the 2d century A.D. The final step in perfecting the calendar was taken by the authority of Pope Gregory XIII in 1582.

Eleven days were dropped from the calendar and centennial years were regarded as leap years only when divisible by 400.

The provision of some sort of a crude calendar was an essential prerequisite of systematic history, but the process had to be carried on a step further before the mechanism for measuring and recording time was sufficiently perfected to be of any considerable service to the historian. It was not enough to be able to measure time by the year and its fractions; it was necessary to have some method of identifying successive years, in other words, to provide a chronology. While the Egyptians had an admirable instrument for fashioning a scientific chronology in the astronomical "Sothic cycle" of 1461 years, they made no use of it and never provided a scientific chronology. The earliest Egyptian approximation to a chronology was the annalistic expedient of naming the years by some great event which happened therein. The famous "Palermo Stele" constitutes the earliest remaining record of these year-lists and is supposed, in its original complete form, to have identified the seven hundred years from 3400 B.C. to 2700 B.C. An advance in methodology was made when the years were named from the regnal years of a particular king. The only great list of Egyptian regnal years which has been preserved, even in a fragmentary condition, is the precious "Turin Papyrus," which has to be supplemented by the lists inscribed on the temple walls of the later dynasties. About 275 B.C. Ptolemy Philadelphus commissioned a learned Egyptian priest, Manetho, to collect and translate into Greek all the Egyptian annals and regnal lists. The fragmentary remains of the labors of Manetho have constituted the skeleton upon which modern Egyptologists have reconstructed the chronology of ancient Egypt. The Babylonians never passed beyond the annalistic stage of chronology—namely, the identifying of years by some conspicuous occurrence. A contemporary of Manetho, Berossos, a Babylonian priest at the court of Antiochus II, tried to do for Babylonian chronology what Manetho had done for Egyptian, but to judge from what remains of his work in the fragments of copyists, he seems to have been less successful. A far greater exactness was given to Assyrian chronology by the fact that the years of a given king were identified by the annual appointment of an official known as a *limmu*. As the name of the contemporary *limmu* was given in the notices of events contained in the clay records, the lists of *limmu*, dating from 892 B.C. to 704 B.C., enable the historian to establish with a high degree of accuracy the Assyrian chronology. In the later period of Assyrian and Babylonian history there developed some conception of an "era," which dated from the reign of Nabonassar, 747 B.C. The Hebrew chronology never developed further than the crude genealogical system of reckoning by generations, the conventional length of which was 40 years. Some vague conception of eras seems also to have arisen, as, for example, the period from Abraham to David, or from David to the "captivity." The classic examples of the Hebrew chronological system are to be found in the opening of the first book of *Chronicles* and in the first chapter of *Matthew*. The early Greek historians, in spite of an admirable starting point for the

Greek era in the semi-mythical siege of Troy and an unusually ingenious mechanism for measuring time in the "Cycle of Meton," did no better than their predecessors in creating a chronology. Down to the middle of the 5th century B.C. the only chronological records possessed by the Greeks were the local genealogies and the names of archons, priests and priestesses. The early attempt of Hellanicus of Lesbos, in the latter half of the 5th century B.C., to fashion a chronology from genealogies and name lists has been described by Bury as "an ingenious edifice erected on foundations that had no solidity," but even the attempt had some significance. Neither Herodotus nor Thucydides made any attempt at solving the problem of chronology, and the later Greek historians finished their work with no more satisfactory system of chronology than the clumsy method of reckoning by Olympiac years introduced by Timaeus about 300 B.C. The Olympic "era" was dated from the alleged Olympic games in 776 B.C. The laudable effort of Eratosthenes, about 80 years after Timaeus, to put Greek chronology on the firm basis of astronomical measurements was little utilized or encouraged by the historians, though the astronomical researches of the Alexandrian scientists were of the utmost importance for the future of chronology. The practical minded Romans were the first people of antiquity to devise a rational and reliable system of chronology. They dated their years from the mythical foundation of Rome in 753 B.C. The monstrosities of the Christian chronology introduced by Julius Africanus, Eusebius and Jerome, as well as the real foundations of modern scientific chronology with Scaliger's "De emendatione temporum" and Dom Clément's "L'Art de vérifier les dates" will be dealt with later. It is sufficient here to bear in mind the fact that only the Roman chronology enabled an historical writer of antiquity to deal with assurance with anything save contemporary history. This serves in part to explain why the great historical works of Greece were strictly in the field of recent and contemporary history. Now that the development of the indispensable prerequisites of historical writing has been briefly touched upon, attention may be turned to the origins of historical writing in antiquity.

III. ORIENTAL BEGINNINGS OF HISTORICAL WRITING.

While the climatic conditions have made Egypt a veritable archaeological museum, or, as Professor Breasted has termed it, "a vast historical volume," and have made possible the preservation of very valuable and extensive sources of historical information in the remains of the architecture, the engineering feats, the plastic art, and even the inscriptions cut on the stone surfaces of tombs, palaces, temples and monuments, there have been few or no Egyptian historical writings preserved. With the exception of a few fragmentary *annals*, such as the "Palermo Stele" no native Egyptian historical writings have been discovered except the garbled and incomplete work of Manetho referred to above. One may safely agree with Professor Hall that "no real historian is known to us in Pharaonic Egypt, nor is it likely that one will ever be discovered."

While the true historical narrative can scarcely be held to have originated with the Babylonians or Assyrians, they certainly made a closer approximation to this achievement than the Egyptians. The earliest historical writings of the Babylonians, dating back to the third millennium B.C., were the votive inscriptions, giving the names of the kings, their genealogies and a record of the buildings they erected. The great cylinder inscriptions of Gudea (2450 B.C.) are a valuable source for the contemporary manners and customs, while the Code of Hammurabi (2150 B.C.) is probably the most important single document in the history of jurisprudence. In the period following Hammurabi there were important writings of the kings setting forth their achievements, but in an epic rather than a truly historical manner. The second Babylonian kingdom of the 6th century B.C. contributed some important *chronicles* epitomizing some much earlier narratives, which are now preserved only in fragments, and lists of the Babylonian kings. While the Babylonians were concerned mainly with the arts of peace, the Assyrians dealt primarily with the feats of war in their annals and campaign and votive inscriptions. A most important historical document, ascribed by some to Babylonian and by others to Assyrian sources, is the 'Synchronous History,' compiled in the 8th century B.C. This describes the successive boundary disputes between Babylonia and Assyria from 1600 to 800 B.C., with a list of the kings who participated. Finally, from Assyrian sources there are the above mentioned lists of *limmi* or the *eponym canon*, covering the period from 892-704 B.C. The Babylonian counterpart of Manetho's work, Berossos' history of Babylonia in three books, written about 280 B.C., was the first systematic historical narrative produced by a Babylonian or Assyrian scribe. It has, unfortunately, been lost and only survives in scanty references in Josephus, Eusebius and a few other later historians. Whatever its value, its date shows that real historical narrative was not a product of the period of the height of either Babylonian or Assyrian culture.

The honor of having first produced a true historical narrative of considerable scope and high relative veracity must be accorded to the Hebrews of ancient Palestine. The conventional assumption of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch and the synchronous nature of its books, questioned by Hobbes in 1651 and by Spinoza in 1670, was riddled by the French physician, Jean Astruc in 1753, and the German theologian, Karl David Ilgen in 1799. The true nature of the composite authorship of the Pentateuch and the widely divergent dates of the composition of its various books were established as a result of the work of a number of courageous and brilliant scholars, the most prominent of whom were Professor De Wette of Jena, Professor Hupfeld of Halle, Professor George of Berlin, Bishop Colenso of Natal, Professor Kuennen of Leyden, Professor Robertson Smith of Cambridge, Professor Bacon of Yale, and, above all, Professor Julius Wellhausen of Greifswald and Göttingen. Their labors have revealed the fact that the Pentateuch was the work of some five different authors, or groups of authors, writing between 900 and 450 B.C., their diverse writings were consolidated in the Pentateuch, as it is now

arranged, some time before 400 B.C. The oldest, or "Jahvist" source, was written about 900 B.C., the next, or "Elohist," about 725 B.C., the third, or "Deuteronomist," from about 700 to 620 B.C., the fourth, or "Holiness Code," about 575 B.C., and the last, or "Priestly Book," about 450 B.C. Their union, upon the fifth source as a basis, was accomplished some time in the 5th century B.C. The beginnings of the historical narrative among the Hebrews were stimulated by the great expansion of Hebrew prosperity and prestige under Saul, David and Solomon. As Professor Moore has said, "the making of great history has often given a first impulse to the writing of history, and we may well believe that it was so in Israel, and that the beginning of Hebrew historical literature, in the proper sense of the word, was made with Saul and David." This origin of Hebrew historical writing, which marks the earliest appearance of true historical narrative of which any record has been preserved, is to be found in the work of the unknown author of the "Jahvist" sources of the Pentateuch, Joshua, the Books of Samuel and the opening of the first Book of Kings. Of the labors of this writer, who, though he can claim the honor of being the first of the line of true historians, is known only to students by the recently acquired appellation of "J," Professor Breasted makes the following comment, "they are the earliest example of historical writings in prose which we possess among any people, and their nameless author is the earliest historian whom we have found in the early world." The "Jahvist" narrative reaches its highest point in 2 Samuel, ix-xx, which is probably the best example of both Hebrew and Oriental historical writing. Of this passage Edouard Meyer says: "It is astonishing that historical literature of this character should have been possible in Israel at this time. It stands far above everything which we know elsewhere of ancient Oriental historical writing." The remaining historical books of the Old Testament Canon were the Books of Kings, which were written about 575 B.C., and Chronicles—Ezra—Nehemiah, written about 300 B.C. The Books of Kings were the first practical illustration of Polybius', Dionysius of Halicarnassus' and Lord Bolingbroke's view of history as "philosophy teaching by example," for the author sought primarily to convince his people by historical illustrations of the disasters that had come to the Hebrews by deserting their national religion. Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah constitute the work of a single author, who by genealogies and narrative surveys the whole of Hebrew history with the aim of glorifying through tremendous exaggerations the splendor of the Hebrew kingdom under David and Solomon, and of re-emphasizing the warning of the author of Kings respecting the penalty of deviation from the true religion. Both Kings and Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah are distinctly inferior to "J" from the standpoint of accuracy and lucid narrative. One of the greatest products of Hebrew historiography is a work, which, for some curious reason, has not been included in the Protestant canon of the Bible—the first Book of Maccabees. This narrative, written about 125 B.C. by a devout and vigorous Sadducee and an ardent admirer of the Asmonean house—a sort of a Judean Treitschke—tells the stirring story of Hebrew history from the con-

quest of Palestine by Alexander the Great to the accession of John Hyrcanus. The work centres about the deliverance of Palestine from Syrian domination through the military exploits of Judas Maccabeus and his successors. While fired by the thrills of patriotic pride, the author produced a unique work for his time, in that he explained the victories of the Hebrews as having resulted from the personal ability and courage of the Asmoneans and not from the direct intervention of the Deity in behalf of the Jews. Unfortunately, however, the Christian historians of mediæval Europe took as their Hebrew model not the brilliant secular narrative of First Maccabees, but sought to strengthen their followers' zeal and to terrorize their opponents by imitation of the more conventional Hebrew tales of the miraculous interposition of the Deity in rewarding the faithful and punishing the sinner. The last of the distinguished Hebrew historians was Flavius Josephus (c. 37-105 A.D.). He was the national historian of the Jews and, writing after the destruction of the power of his people in 70 A.D., he tried to compensate for the contemporary distress of the Jewish people by emphasizing the glories of their past. Consequently, he almost outdid the author of *Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah* in his exaggeration of the wealth, population and international prestige of ancient Palestine. His two chief works were the 'War of the Jews' and the 'Antiquities of the Jews.' In his treatment of the Old Testament period his narrative is highly unreliable, but the discussion of the post-Maccabean era is a most valuable source of information, though not wholly free from exaggeration and credulity. He wrote in Greek with a considerable degree of literary skill and he has been referred to as the 'Livy of the Jews,' but, while the comparison is not without some basis, Josephus did not equal the national historian of Rome in either literary merit or in accuracy of statement. Though the Hebrews brought into being the historical narrative, Hebrew historiography did not affect the general current of the development of historical writing until after the Christians had taken over the sacred books of the Jews and used them as the basis, not only of much of their theology, but also as the foundation of their chronology and their synthesis of the history of the past. It is to the Greeks that attention must be turned in describing the chief source of the origins and development of the type of historical writing which dominated classical antiquity and prevailed to the time of Julius Africanus, Orosius and Eusebius.

IV. HISTORICAL WRITING AMONG THE GREEKS.

1. **The Intellectual Setting of the Origins of Greek Historiography.**—The birth of historical writing in Greece required several essential conditions which did not exist before the 6th century B.C., namely, the writing of prose, the critical rejection of the current mythology concerning Greek origins and the stimulation of interest in social origins and institutions. By the middle of the 6th century these indispensable prerequisites of history had come into being in the city of Miletus in Ionia. Cadmus of Miletus, at the beginning of the 6th century, had introduced the practice of writing prose instead of poetry and ranks as one of the earliest of Greek

prose writers or *logographoi*. At the same period there was coming into existence that speculative Ionian philosophy to which the world owes the origin of free thought and critical philosophy. As Professor Bury has said, "Our deepest gratitude is due to the Greeks as the originators of liberty of thought and discussion. Ionia in Asia Minor was the cradle of free speculation. The history of European science and European philosophy begins in Ionia. Here in the 6th and 5th centuries B.C. the earliest philosophers by using their reason sought to penetrate into the origin and structure of the world. They began the work of destroying orthodox views and religious faiths." Finally, the Persian absorption of Ionia tended to break down the provincialism of the Ionian Greeks, through that all-important factor of the contact of cultures, and to arouse their interest in the civilization of the diverse peoples who dwelt in the great empire of which they had recently become a part. The origin of Greek historical literature, then, was a part of that great intellectual movement conventionally known as the rise of the *logographoi* and of the critical Greek philosophy in Ionia. To these more general or cultural explanations of the appearance of the first Greek historical literature, there should be added the personal impulse from the dominating desire of the more prominent citizens of the time to link up their families with a distinguished genealogy. Hesiod had favored the Greek gods by providing them with a respectable ancestry, and a similar service was rendered to the nobles by the *logographoi*.

2. **The Origins of Greek Historiography.**—

In view of the foregoing sketch of the intellectual environment of early Greek critical prose, it seems but in the natural course of events that the first Greek historian should have been Hecataeus (born 550 B.C.), a native of Miletus, the birthplace of both Greek prose and Greek critical philosophy. His main significance lies in the fact that he foreshadowed two significant developments of scientific historical method by setting up truth as the ideal of his statements and by assuming a frankly critical attitude toward the conventional Greek creation myths. The opening paragraph of his 'Genealogies' is the first approximation on the part of any writer to a consciousness of the function of historical criticism, "What I write here," he said, "is the account which I considered to be true; for the stories of the Greeks are numerous, and in my opinion ridiculous."

The influences which had produced Hecataeus grew more powerful and the necessary developments between his 'Genealogies' and the 'History' of Herodotus were rapidly consummated. Charon of Lampsacus and Dionysius of Miletus compiled histories of Persia during the middle of the 5th century and Scylax of Caryanda produced the first historical biography. In the latter half of the 5th century Antiochus of Syracuse composed the first history devoted to the peoples of Greece, and Hellanicus of Lesbos opened the way for Herodotus by the breadth of his interests. He not only covered the history of Persia and Greece from a broad social point of view, but also was the earliest of the Greek historians to recognize the necessity of a comprehensive system of chronology and to attempt to supply it.

3. The Systematic Historical Works of Greek Writers.—The first, and in the estimate of modern exponents of "Kulturgeschichte," the greatest of the systematic Greek historians was Herodotus of Halicarnassus (c. 480-425 B.C.). By his interest in geography and in the civilizations of the East he gave evidence of his Ionic antecedents, while by his dominant concern with the Athenian democracy he gave proof of the transfer of historical attention to Hellenic society. His 'History' was a narrative of Graeco-Asiatic relations and contacts from the reign of Croesus of Lydia (560-546 B.C.) to the defeat of the Persian invasion in 478 B.C. The central theme was the destruction of the forces of Xerxes by the Greeks. But his work was not like that of his great successor, Thucydides, narrowly political and military. It was the story of the struggle of two fundamentally opposed types of civilization, and to prove this antagonism, Herodotus surveyed the foundations of these two cultures to locate the deeper causes of the conflict. It combined, thus, the characteristics of a "Kulturgeschichte" and a "Weltgeschichte," though both were strictly limited in point of time. An ardent admirer of Athenian "democracy" he eulogized Athens and its triumph over autocratic Persian imperialism with the epic fervor of a Bancroft. While recognizing and stating the fundamental principles of historical criticism, he often deserted them, especially in his credulity in accepting the tales he heard on his travels. On the whole, however, modern historical, archaeological and ethnographic research has tended to confirm rather than to discredit his statements, and no subsequent historian has been more keen or sympathetic in his analysis of human nature. As the scope of history has been broadened in recent years through the reassertion of the value and position of "Kulturgeschichte," the slogan has come more and more to be "back to Herodotus" rather than "back to Thucydides," as was long so popular.

As much as subsequent historiography owes to Herodotus with respect to an illustration of the proper scope of history, it is equally indebted to Thucydides (c. 465-396 B.C.) for contributions to the methodology of historical research and to the construction of a coherent historical narrative. His theme, the Peloponnesian War (431-404 B.C.), was as much more narrow and restricted a field than that covered by Herodotus as the American Civil War would be as compared with the evolution of civilization in the 19th century. As his history was in part prepared by Thucydides during the course of the conflict, it was the work of a scholarly and philosophic war correspondent—an antique Hilaire Belloc—rather than of the dispassionate historian reconstructing the events of a distant past from a study of the documents. His sketch of the rise of Greece shows, however, that he had rare power in portraying the past if he had seen fit to utilize it. His greatest contribution to historiography was in the field of criticism and methodology. He set forth with great vigor the thesis that the permanence and enduring fame of an historical work should depend rather upon the accuracy of the statements than upon the entertainment furnished by the narrative. Ranke, at the opening of the 19th century, did not state more effectively than Thucydides had at the close of

the 5th century B.C. that accuracy of data was the foundation of history. The second great historical canon of Thucydides was "relevance" of material, something widely at variance with the long and numerous digressions of Herodotus. To these should be added his ability in the mastery of details and their subordination to the movement of the whole narrative. In these respects Thucydides may rightly be held to have been the founder of scientific and critical history. Finally, while Thucydides has received much credit in this respect which really belongs to Polybius, he was probably the first historian clearly and definitely to state the alleged "pragmatic" value of the writing and study of history. In the opinion of Thucydides, "the accurate knowledge of what has happened will be useful, because, according to human probability, similar things will happen again." Though his writings must not be judged by the canons of Lamprecht's Historical Institute, the Sorbonne or L'École des Chartes, they were not free from major defects. He was unable to grasp the concept of time and to view his facts in their true historical perspective. He narrowed the field of history not only to a consideration merely of contemporary political phenomena, but even to the external military and diplomatic phases of political activity. He missed the vital significance of the deeper social and economic forces in history, a weakness perhaps over-emphasized by Mr. Cornford. It can scarcely be doubted, moreover, that he carried the element of "relevance" too far and omitted as much material that was pertinent as Herodotus had included which was not germane to the subject. Again, he illustrated Carlyle's weakness in his dramatic interpretation of events in terms of great personalities, and he did not possess the latter's ability to portray a personality in its entirety. Lastly, there appeared little or none of Mabillon's profound discussion of the critical use of documents; his sources were carefully concealed in order that the style of the narrative might not suffer. One may agree entirely with Bury that the work of Thucydides marks the longest and most decisive step that has ever been taken by a single man towards making history what it is to-day, without regarding that statement as an unmixed compliment. Thucydides certainly was influential in bringing historiography under the domination of the "political fetish" and the spell of episodes from which it suffered from classical times to the end of the 19th century, and from which it is only now beginning to escape. It must not be forgotten that, as Lamprecht has insisted, historical accuracy means as much the presentation of the complete analysis of an event, period or movement as it does the mere truth of such facts as are narrated. From the standpoint of this broader and more fundamental view of historical accuracy Thucydides will scarcely rank as superior to Herodotus. The ardent admirers of the former have forgotten that scope and content are quite as important in history as refinement of the methodology of research.

An historian far inferior to Herodotus or Thucydides was Xenophon (c. 430-354 B.C.). His literary ability was of a high order, but his capacity for profound historical analysis was most limited. He was a good memoir

writer and his 'Anabasis' was one of the most absorbing of Greek memoirs. In his 'Hellenica' he attempted to continue the narrative of Thucydides from 411 to 362 B.C. While this work is most valuable as an historical source for the period, it is superficial and owes what historical merit it possesses primarily to its imitation of the method and arrangement of the work of Thucydides. On the whole, it is safe to agree with Bury that he owes his reputation to the fact that an uncritical generation later preserved his writings, while allowing more meritorious works to perish and that "if he had lived in modern days, he would have been a high-class journalist and pamphleteer and would have made his fortune as a war-correspondent." It would not be fair, however, to overlook the remarkable versatility of Xenophon's literary talents, which were exhibited in memoirs, biography, systematic history, constitutional analysis and economic theory.

The last of the major Greek historians was Polybius (c. 198-117 B.C.). From the standpoint of either productivity or profundity he was superior to Thucydides and was fully equal to him with respect to accuracy of statement, but his style being labored and diffuse he has been less popular than his two great predecessors. His 'History' was a vast work in 40 books dealing with the expansion of the Roman Empire to 146 B.C. As Herodotus had mirrored the interest of early Greek historians in the East, and Thucydides had written of Athens at the height of its civilization, so Polybius testified to the decline of Hellas and the shifting of interest to the new empire of the West. His scholarship was equal to that of the great historian of British expansion, but he lacked the latter's power of compression and lucid statement. In the 12th book of his work is found, as a critique of the antiquarian, Timaeus, the first great treatise on the methodology of scientific history. Conceived independently of Thucydides, this discussion has scarcely been surpassed, and his impartiality is a model for all historians. Especially noteworthy was his Ritter-like insistence upon the value of a knowledge of topography to the historian. He intended his history to be intensely pragmatic—to be "philosophy teaching by example," but he never allowed the philosopher in him to overcome the historian. Greatly interested in the problem of causation, he went deeper in his analysis of impersonal causes than Thucydides, though his interpretation was ethical rather than economic and social. The following brief quotation from his 12th book admirably epitomizes his views as to the scope, methods and purpose of history. "The science of history is three-fold: first, the dealing with written documents and the arrangement of the material thus obtained; second, topography, the appearance of cities and localities, the description of rivers and harbors, and, speaking generally, the peculiar features of the seas and countries and their relative distances; thirdly, political affairs. . . . The special province of history is, first, to ascertain what the actual words used were; and secondly, to learn why it was that a particular policy or arrangement failed or succeeded. For a bare statement of an occurrence is interesting indeed, but not instructive; but when this is supplemented by a

statement of cause, the study of history becomes fruitful. For it is by applying analogies to our own circumstances that we get the means and basis for calculating the future; and for learning from the past when to act with caution, and when with greater boldness, in the present." All in all, one may agree with Professor Botsford that "a careful reading of this author is the best possible introduction to the spirit and method of history as we of to-day regard it."

4. Minor Contributions to Greek Historiography.—Polybius was unique in his age as an historian. Long before he composed his great work Hellenic historiography had begun to decline from the standard set by Thucydides and was brought under the influence of rhetoric in the 4th century. With their tendency to insipid moralizing, the interpolation of florid speeches, and their "passion for panegyrics," the historical works of the rhetorical school, like those of Froissart and Lamartine "exhibited artistic but not historical genius." This capitulation to the popular demand for rhetoric Hermann Peter believes to have been the main cause for the decline and stagnation of Greek history and its Roman imitations. Of the "Rhetoricians" of the 4th century the leader was Isocrates and the chief historians of the school were Ephorus and Theopompus. The work of Ephorus was probably the nearest approach in Greek historiography to a "national history" of Hellas. Of quite a different character was the work of Timaeus of Tauromenium who devoted a lifetime of labor to the patient compilation of a vast repository of reliable facts concerning the history of Sicily and Italy. He was the first and the greatest of the antiquarians that flourished in the 3d century and he may be regarded as the prototype of Blondus and Mabillon. Two later ambitious compilations—the 'Weltgeschichte' of Diodorus of Sicily (c. 90-21 B.C.) and the Roman history of his younger contemporary, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, were of a far inferior order, though, perhaps, superior to the work of the "Rhetoricians."

Historical biography among the Greeks was founded by Isocrates, the leader of the "Rhetoricians," and one of the earliest products was the biography of Agesilaus by Xenophon. Subsequent historians devoted considerable space to biography. Plutarch's (c. 50-125 A.D.) polished 'Parallel Lives' have remained at the head of the world's biographical product on account of their compelling interest, if not for their entire historical accuracy. Indeed, it must be remembered that Plutarch was a moralist and wrote his "Lives" not as strictly historical biographies, but in order to furnish concrete illustrations of his ethical principles for the moral edification of his readers.

In the period of the Hellenic revival in Rome a number of Greek historians made contributions to historical writing of widely different merit. Among the less notable productions were the 'Anabasis of Alexander' by Arrian (c. 95-175 A.D.) and the 'History of Rome' by Appian, in the same period. Far superior to these were the incisive 'History of Rome' of Dio Cassius (c. 155-240 A.D.), and the broadly conceived history of the later Roman empire, in its social as well as its political conditions, by Ammianus Marcellinus (c. 330-401 A.D.), the

last of the long and honorable list of Greek historians who, curiously enough, wrote his work in Latin.

V. ROMAN HISTORIOGRAPHY.

Rome added no original contributions to historiography. As in all other phases of its culture, Rome here followed the model set up by the Greeks. While there were distinguished Roman historians, none equalled Thucydides or Polybius for careful adherence to critical method and only Livy and Tacitus approached the best of the stylists among Greek historians.

The immediate dependence of the Roman historiography on the Greek is evident from the fact that down to the 2d century B.C. all the Roman historical literature was even written in Greek. These early historical works in Greek were chiefly 'Annals' of which the first and most famous were those of Fabius Pictor (c. 250 B.C.). The first Roman historical literature in Latin was the *Origines* of Cato the Censor (c. 234-149 B.C.), in which he narrated the history of Rome interpreted according to his notorious bucolic and aristocratic prejudices. The first real historian among the Romans in point of time was that leader of all Romans in ability, Julius Caesar (100-44 B.C.). Generally accurate and always clear, forceful and direct in his style, Caesar's apologies for his public career—the 'Commentaries' and the 'Civil War' were the best historical memoirs produced in the ancient world and rank well with those of any period. A more systematic historian was Sallust (c. 86-34 B.C.) the Roman disciple of Thucydides. His chief work, a history of Rome from 78 to 67 B.C. has never been recovered, but from his monographs on the 'Conspiracy of Catiline' and the 'Jugurthine War' one can appreciate his vigorous and graphic style and his power in the analysis of personalities and social forces, but he was not able wholly to conceal his pessimism with regard to the future of the Roman state in the last years of the Republic. The great national history of Rome was that of Livy (59 B.C.-17 A.D.). His work was a massive epic of the growth of the Roman world-state. While he had a general appreciation of the value of accuracy of statement, he subordinated this element to that of perfection of style, and the Greek "Rhetoricians" rather than Thucydides were his model. The great literary merit of Livy's history, its ministry to the national vanity of the Romans and their cult of modern admirers, and its great popularity with the humanists have given it a position in historiography higher than its purely historical value would warrant. A less successful example of the Roman historical writing of the rhetorical school was the history of Rome under the early empire by Velleius Paterculus in the period of Tiberius. The last of the major Roman historians was Tacitus (c. 55-120 A.D.). Like Polybius, he was a man of action, and, being an ardent admirer of the aristocratic Republic, his view of contemporary Roman society was even more pessimistic than that of Sallust. While he wrote with great vigor, had rare power of portraying personalities and was generally accurate, the subjective moralizing element in his writings, while adding to their literary reputation, greatly reduced their historical value. To him and to Juvenal

is primarily due that notorious and venerable myth of the "moral causes" for the decline of the Roman Empire, which was later revived and elaborated with such deplorable results by Kingsley. In addition to his purely historical works—the 'Annals,' the 'Histories' and the biography of Agricola, dealing with Roman history in the 1st century of the Christian era, the 'Germania' was one of the earliest excursions into the field of descriptive sociology. Being the only extensive source of information regarding the institutions of the Germans of that time, the 'Germania' has acquired a great importance in later years. It has been the most controversial historical document in existence, excepting only the Pentateuch and the Synoptic Gospels. Recovered in the period of the humanists and brought before the learned public by Poggio, Enoc of Ascoli, and Conrad Celtis, it has been the centre of historical conflict between the modern Teutonist and Gallican historians, as much as Alsace-Lorraine has been the pivotal point in the political and military rivalry of their respective national States. More than this, the tendency of Tacitus to idealize the early Germans at the expense of the Romans originated that humorous but disastrous perversion of the interpretation of the "invasions" which culminated in the vagaries of Charles Kingsley's "The Roman and the Teuton." The last Roman historian of any repute, unless it be the vague figure that Kornemann has endeavored to reconstruct, was Suetonius (75-160 A.D.), the erudite secretary of Hadrian. His diffuse 'Lives of the Caesars,' while reliable in its description of public affairs, was one of the earliest examples of historical "muckraking" and "scandal mongering." His chief significance in historiography lies in the fact that he became the model in style and arrangement for the historical biography of the period of humanism. Though the Roman historians were not original and were always more or less under the spell of the Greek "Rhetoricians," Roman historiography was incomparably higher in the sphere of reliability than the type which was to succeed it and was to bring historical writing back under the spell of mythology and religious prejudices from which it had escaped with Hecateus of Miletus eight centuries earlier.

VI. PATRISTIC HISTORIOGRAPHY.

1. The Christian Synthesis of the History of the Past.—One of the most effective agencies in allaying suspicion and attracting converts to a movement is the ability to point to a glorious past. The Christians felt this keenly, and, having adopted the sacred books of the Jews as the official record of their antecedents, they were faced with the immediate and pressing necessity of giving to ancient Hebrew history a prestige which it had entirely lacked in the works of pagan historians, who had assigned to the history of the Jewish people only that slender allotment of space and attention to which their inconspicuous political history had entitled them. Therefore, the two world histories, which had already been produced by Diodorus Siculus and Pompeius Trogus, and which were immensely superior to any universal history compiled by Patristic historians, were utterly unsuited to the requirements of Christian

propaganda. Neither was the general Jewish history of Josephus acceptable, for, while it exaggerated tremendously the role of the Jews, it was distinctly antagonistic to the Christians. Therefore, the Christian "literati" set about to produce a synthesis of the past which would give due weight to the alleged glories of Hebrew antiquity and would, at the same time, show why the Jews were no longer worthy of their heritage, which had now passed to the Christians. The first writer to essay the task was Sextus Julius Africanus (c. 180-250) who composed a history of the world in five books bringing the story to 221 A.D. In this he tried to harmonize and synchronize Hebrew and Christian history with that of the four great successive pagan monarchies—the Assyrian, Persian, Macedonian and Roman. This was carried further in the 'Chronicle' of Eusebius (c. 260-340), and Jerome was able to find scriptural sanction for this synthesis in the prophecy contained in the last chapters of Daniel, "That long history," says Professor Burr, "which was now their preamble was the sacred story of the chosen people, with its Jacob's ladder forever linking earth to heaven. The central actor was Jehovah, now the God of all the earth. About that story and its culmination all other history must now fall into place; and from the sacred record—for the record too is sacred—may be learned the plans of the Omnipotent. It was Jerome who now found them in the interpretations and the visions of Daniel—in the image with head of gold and belly of brass, in the four great beasts that came up out of the sea—and from his day on almost to ours the changing empires of earth have been forced to find a place within that scheme." Whatever in non-sacred annals was found in conflict with Holy Writ must be discarded. What was left must be adjusted to its words. Man's career on earth became a fall. Nor might human wit exalt itself: Pythagoras and Plato had learned from Moses; Seneca from Paul. The Christian synthesis received its great philosophic statement and defense in Augustine's 'City of God' (426). It was finally systematized in the grotesque but fiery 'Seven Books of History directed against the Pagans' (417) of Orosius, which was the standard text on universal history until the revival of the appreciation of pagan culture with the advent of "Humanism," when it was riddled by the scholarship of Flavius Blondus (1388-1463) and was superseded by the 'Enneads' of Sabellicus (1436-1506), the humanist attempt at a universal history.

An important part of the Christian synthesis was the synchronizing of the events in the history of the Gentile and Hebrew nations and the establishment of an official Christian chronology. The initial step was taken in this process by Julius Africanus in his 'Chronographia.' In this, the period of the creation was set as having occurred 5499 years before Christ, and subsequent events in world history were dated through an ingenious combination of the various systems of chronology used by the different nations. Eusebius expanded the work of Africanus in his famous 'Chronicle,' in which he epitomized universal history in a set of parallel synoptic and synchronous chronological tables giving the reigns of the rulers of the "four great monarchies" synchronized with the events

of Hebrew history. "In these tables," says President White, "Moses, Joshua and Bacchus,—Deborah, Orpheus and the Amazons,—Abimelech, the Sphinx, and Oedipus, appear together as personages equally real, and their positions in chronology equally ascertained." The chronology of Eusebius was adopted by Jerome in his 'Chronicle,' and in Jerome's version it became the authoritative Christian chronology until it was slightly revised by Scaliger in 1583 and Usher in 1650. It entered systematic church history in the 'Historia Tripartita' of Cassiodorus and was the introduction to every authentic mediaeval chronicle.

In this Christian synthesis of world history, aside from the artificiality of its chronology and synchronisms, two characteristics are noteworthy, namely, the absurd relative importance attached to Hebrew history and the serious bias against pagan civilization which made an objective historical narrative absolutely impossible. Of the former tendency Professor Robinson has said, "this theological unity of history was won at a tremendous sacrifice of all secular perspective and accuracy. The Amorites were invested with an importance denied the Carthaginians. Enoch and Lot loomed large in an age which scarcely knew Pericles." It is a curious but incontestable fact that the Jewish nation owes its prominence in world history to these distortions of the early Christian historians. Always on the defensive in the Patristic period, the churchmen were compelled to answer the charge of having been the cause of the calamities which came to the Roman Empire in the 4th and 5th centuries. The calamities could not be denied, and so the only procedure possible was to prove a greater prevalence of misery before the Christian era. This was particularly the task assigned by Augustine to Orosius and performed with great thoroughness in the latter's above mentioned work. Deliberately shutting his eyes to all the cultural contributions of antiquity, he gathered a veritable "historia calamitatum" by combing pagan history to present an unrelieved picture "of all the most signal horrors of war, pestilence and famine, of the fearful devastation of earthquakes and inundations, the destruction wrought by fiery eruptions, by lightning and hail, and the awful misery due to crime." "All the achievements of Egypt, Greece and Rome," says a leading historian, "tended to sink out of sight in the mind of Augustine's disciple, Orosius, only the woes of a devil-worshipping heathendom lingered." When one remembers that this work was almost the sole source of information during the Middle Ages regarding the history of pagan antiquity, it is little wonder that Blondus could remark in the 15th century, that since Orosius there had been no history. Yet, in spite of the external and conscious bias of the "Fathers" against pagan culture, they could not escape the unconscious sources of influence springing out of their environment of paganism. Thus, by a curious irony of fate, it came about that the classical culture they assumed to abhor actually influenced their cosmic and historical philosophy as much, if not more, than the cultural traditions of Judaism. The "Fathers" used the classical languages and were always under the spell of classical rhetoric; many of

them were educated as pagans; their syncretic theology was deeply colored with pagan elements; and their political ideals and practices were so thoroughly modelled after those of the Roman Empire that Professor Burr has very aptly described the origins of the Christian ecclesiastical polity as "the rise of the new Rome." This much is evident from such sources of information as have been preserved. If the great mass of early Christian historical writing which has been lost were available for study it might well be that an even greater amount of infiltration of pagan culture could be detected.

2. The Christian Philosophy of History.— Almost as wide as the break with the classical historiography with respect to the status of pagan culture was the difference in the great emphasis placed on pragmatism and teleology in the Patristic historical literature. To the early Christian historians the "process of history" had a real significance and meaning, it was a part of a greater cosmic process in which God and man were the chief participants. "The Christians were perhaps the first to suspect a real grandeur in history," says Professor Robinson, "for to them it became a divine epic, stretching far back to the creation of man and forward to the final separation of good and evil in a last magnificent and decisive crisis." This Christian philosophy of history, which has been so felicitously termed by Santayana the "Christian Epic," was gradually evolved by the "Fathers" and received its final and decisive systematic expression in Augustine's 'City of God.' This philosophy, drawn more from Persian and Hellenic than from Hebrew sources, considered the historic process as a part—the consequential portion—of a great cosmic struggle between the forces of good and evil. In its earthly and historical significance this conflict was a struggle between the City of God—the community of the elect believers in the Hebrew and Christian God—and the City of Satan—the collective name of the previous and contemporary adherents to paganism. Its final outcome was to issue in the glorious triumph of the former and the utter destruction and discomfiture of the latter. With such a philosophical background it is not difficult to understand that Christian historiography was pragmatic to a degree not dreamed of by either Polybius or Dionysius; it was "philosophy teaching by example" with a real vengeance. With such issues at stake the most insignificant event could not fail to have its vital import. This "epic," which received its philosophical exposition from Augustine, was illustrated from history by Orosius and was given an elegant literary form in the 'Chronica' of Sulpicius Severus (363-423).

3. Historical Method in the Patristic Period.— The Christian historians also departed widely from the canons of historical method laid down by Thucydides and Polybius. In addition to their tremendous bias against paganism, which made objectivity out of the question, it was necessary to devise a special method for handling "inspired" documents. To assume towards the Hebrew creation tales the critical attitude that Hecataeus maintained toward the Greek mythology would have been impious and sinful. Therefore, if the obvious content of the

inspired statement was preposterous and unbelievable, some hidden or inner meaning must be found, and, in response to this necessity, allegory and symbolism replaced candor and critical analysis as the foundations of historical method. "Not even Holy Writ," says Professor Burr, "was prized for the poor literal facts of history, but for those deeper meanings, allegorical, moral, anagogical, mystical, to be discerned beneath them." The allegorical method of interpreting the Old Testament had been introduced by the Alexandrian Jew, Philo Judaeus, and appeared in early Christian writings in the Book of Revelations, in "The Epistle of Barnabas" and in "The Shepherd of Hermas." Its main early impulse among the Fathers came from Origen (186-255). According to Origen, says Conybeare, "Whenever we meet with such useless, nay impossible, incidents and precepts as these, we must discard a literal interpretation and consider of what moral interpretation they are capable, with what higher and mysterious meaning they are fraught, what deeper truths they were intended symbolically and in allegory to shadow forth. The divine wisdom has of set purpose contrived these little traps and stumbling blocks in order to cry halt to our slavish historical understanding of the text, by inserting in its midst sundry things that are impossible and unsuitable. The Holy Spirit so waylays us in order that we may be driven by passages which taken in their *prima facie* sense cannot be true or useful, to search for the ulterior truth, and seek in the Scriptures which we believe to be inspired by God a meaning worthy of him." This allegorizing tendency, which vaulted over criticism, was almost universally accepted by the "Fathers" and received its classical expression in the 'Moralia,' or 'Commentary on the Book of Job,' of Gregory the Great (540-604), and the 'Allegoriae quaedam sacrae Scripturae' of Isadore of Seville (d. 636), which gave in chronological order the allegorical significance of all the persons mentioned in the Old and New Testaments. These became standard mediæval manuals on allegory.

Another element which entered into the historical attitude and methodology of the Patristic period was Neoplatonism. With its thesis of the superiority of the emotions and intuition to reason and intellect and its advocacy of "unbounded credulity," it fitted in admirably with the Patristic mental reactions and became an integral part of the psychic complex of the Patristic and mediæval historians and philosophers. Augustine flirted with it in his youth and it loomed large in his later philosophy. Its great mediæval impulse came mainly from the philosophical and literary activities of Erigena. Along with the allegorizing tendency it served to make quite impossible any sceptical and critical attitude towards the sources of historical knowledge.

Not only were these two standards for the use and interpretation of historical documents erected, but there were also delimited two sharply defined fields of history, the sacred and the profane, the first relating to religious and the latter to secular activities. It is needless to remark that an incomparably greater importance was attached to sacred history and that the working of a miracle was considered much more significant than the making of a constitu-

tion. The "Fathers" were willing to devote the most extended labor to the allegorical explanation of dubious and contradictory statements in scripture, but it is impossible to imagine one gathering and analyzing the contents of 158 constitutions. It is only fair to state, however, that the evident decline of historical scholarship in the Patristic period cannot be wholly assigned to the Christian attitude towards historical data and problems. Though there were the reasons enumerated above why the Christian historiography was bound to be less sound than its pagan counterpart, it cannot be denied that the period of the "Later Roman Empire" was one of general intellectual decline, and the lapse of the ideals of the height of classical culture affected pagan, as well as Christian, writers.

4. Systematic Ecclesiastical History in the Patristic Period.—The most creditable performances in the realm of Patristic historiography were achieved in the field of systematic history of the Christian Church. Though the "Weltanschauung" of the writers marred their perspective and warped their interpretation, the resulting damage to historical scholarship was least in this department. While the anti-pagan bias, the lust for the miraculous, the pious credulity of the writers and the Christian philosophy of history were all in evidence, the very nature of the subject made their operation less disastrous here than in the synthesis of the history of antiquity; attention was centered, almost entirely upon ecclesiastical matters and the writers dealt in a large degree with their co-religionists of the immediate past who scarcely received the reverence accorded to personages who had figured in scriptural events—the Church Fathers, like the makers of the American constitution, were not always canonized by their own generation.

The earliest semi-narrative sources of the history of the foundations of Christianity are to be found in the "Epistles" of the 1st century and in the "Synoptic Gospels," written probably in the last quarter of the century. Of the former, the most important, naturally, are those of Paul, the great organizing missionary and theologian of the early Church. Of the Gospels, the earliest and most reliable is the straight-forward narrative of Mark, written about 70 A.D. The "Acts of the Apostles," the remaining canonical historical work of the Apostolic period, was written by the author of Luke about 100 A.D. The "Apologists" of the 2d and 3d centuries are also valuable sources of information, though their writings were highly controversial. The first, and the most erudite and scholarly systematic ecclesiastical history of the Patristic period was the work of Eusebius of Caesarea (c. 260-340). His "History of the Christian Church," which, in 10 books, brought the story to 324, was a work of massive erudition and relatively high impartiality, but was compiled without literary skill and was most superficial in its analysis of the underlying causes of the great social and religious movements. Though he was not a profound thinker, Eusebius was a real scholar and the literature he examined in the execution of his work was enormous. Many of the most important documents he used were copied in *extenso* in his history; this makes the work a most valuable source book which contains the only extant por-

tions of some highly important early Christian writings. A vast gulf exists between the level of the histories of Eusebius and Orosius.

The "History" of Eusebius was continued by the historians Socrates, Sozomen and Theodoret in the 5th century. The whole was combined and translated into Latin under the direction of Cassiodorus (477-570) in the 6th century, and the narrative was continued to 518. This product of Cassiodorus and his disciples, known as the "Historia tripartita," was the general manual of church history throughout the middle ages. Though confused, incoherent, inaccurate, and annalistic, it was certainly superior to the companion text-book on secular history by Orosius. The greatest defect in the early Church histories was their failure to analyze the deeper forces and the more significant events in the great religious movement which they were describing. This was due in part to the belief that Christianity was being advanced through divine favor and in part to the fact that the writers all succumbed to the temptation to treat primarily of wonders, miracles, martyrs and saints.

Christian biography was founded by Jerome's "De viris illustribus," a brief sketch of the lives of all who had contributed to the body of Christian literature, and by the biographies of the earlier saints and hermits. Jerome's work was continued by Gennadius (c. 495), a priest of Marseilles, and by Isadore of Seville in works of the same title. Isadore's compilation was, in turn, supplemented by that of Ildephonsus of Toledo (d. 667), and the process of addition continued through the mediæval period to culminate in the collection of 963 biographies in the "Liber scriptorum ecclesiasticorum" of Johannes Trithemius (1462-1516), abbot of Sponheim. The astonishing credulity of even the most learned of these early biographers, and their zeal for "miracle-mongering" can best be appreciated by a perusal of such a work as Jerome's "Life of Paul the First Hermit" or Athanasius' "Life of Saint Anthony."

VII. HISTORICAL LITERATURE IN THE MIDDLE AGES.

1. Its Relation to Patristic Antecedents.—It will be evident from the foregoing discussion that Orosius and Cassiodorus were the standard historical authorities for the Middle Ages and that there was no break with the Patristic philosophy of history or historical methods. "The Middle Ages," says Professor Burr, "did not dissever history and theology. Nay to forbid it there grew to completeness that consummate preserver of the unity of thought, the procedure against heresy. And to the end of that long age of faith history did not escape the paternal eye." The chief representatives of historiography in the Middle Ages, as of other phases of mediæval culture, were churchmen of one sort or another. The same zeal for the miraculous and diabolical and disregard of such non-essential "commonplaces" as the foundation and disruption of states and epoch-making political, economic and social movements still persisted unimpaired. The "Christian Epic" kept its prestige unshattered and almost unchallenged for 14 centuries, disturbed only slightly by the 13th century "revival," the growth of humanism and the controversies of the Reformation period. It never received its first staggering blow until

in the 18th century, the English and French "Deists" and "Philosophes" revealed its weaknesses and inconsistencies by their penetrating and disconcerting criticism. If anything, in at least the first centuries after the close of the Patristic period, there was a decline in scholarship. The mediæval writers not only retained the Patristic defects but added to them the absence of the great erudition of many of the "Fathers" and the presence of those crudities incident to a recent emergence from barbarism. This assimilation of the Patristic outlook and methodology and its adaptation to mediæval capacities was primarily the work of Rhabanus Maurus (776-856), his pupil and disciple, Walafrid Strabo (c. 809-849) and John Scotus Eriugena (d. 877). Heinrich von Sybel thus summarizes the outstanding characteristics of mediæval historiography in a manner which brings out clearly its close relation to Patristic historical literature: "This period possessed no idea of historical judgment, no sense of historical reality, no trace of critical reflection. The principle of authority, ruling without limitation in the religious domain, defended all tradition, as well as traditional dogma. Men were everywhere more inclined to believe than to examine, everywhere imagination had the upper hand of reason. No distinction was made between ideal and real, between poetical and historical truth. Heroic poems were considered a true and lofty form of history and history was everywhere displaced by epics, legends or poetical fiction of some kind. A course of slow historical development was traced back to a single great deed, a single personal cause. Almost no one scrupled to give to existing conditions the sanction of venerable age by means of fabricated history or forged documents. The question whether the ascribed derivation was true interested no one; it was enough if the result harmonized with existing rights, dominating interests and prevalent beliefs."

2. Mediæval Annals and Chronicles.—An excellent illustration of the primitive nature of mediæval culture is the fact that during the first centuries the main form of historical writings was the "Annals" which had been common in early Egypt and Babylonia. The mediæval example of this type of historical writing originated in the early Carolingian period as an incident of the mediæval desire to locate the exact occurrence of Easter. The absence of a general knowledge of astronomy and chronology made it necessary for the more learned churchmen to prepare and distribute to monks and priests Easter tables giving the dates upon which Easter would occur for many years in advance. An almost universal practice arose of indicating on the margin opposite each year, the event, which, in the mind of the recorder, seemed to make that year most significant in the history of the locality. Not only were these early annals very scanty in the information they contained, on account of mentioning only one or two conspicuous events which occurred during the year, but they were rendered still less valuable because the mediæval annalist frequently considered most important some insignificant avowed miracle or the transfer of the bones of a saint, information of little or no value to the modern investigator. In time, however, entries were more frequent and the interests of the

annalist grew wider, until the annals became, with such a work as Roger of Hoveden's "Annals of English History," in the early 13th century, a valuable record of the development of a nation.

The origin and development of the "Chronicle" was immediately related to the growth of the annals. The annals were primarily a yearly record set down by a contemporary. The chronicle was more comprehensive. It normally consisted in the summarizing of the history of a considerable period on the basis of one or more sets of annals, preserving the chronological arrangement of the annals. Many of the events transcribed by the chronicler might have occurred before his period and he might combine the records contained in several annals in order to obtain a more complete and comprehensive story. To this compilation of annals was usually added, as an introduction, Jerome's translation of Eusebius' "Chronicle," which linked up the local chronicle with the Christian synthesis of world history from the beginning of creation. With the expansion of the basic annals in scope and pertinence, the chronicles became more and more an approximation to a history, until in the "Anglo Saxon Chronicle," the "Chronicle" of Hermann of Reichenau (d. 1054), the "Universal Chronicle" of Ekkehard of Aurach in the early 12th century, the "Chronicle" of Otto of Freising (d. 1158) and the "Greater Chronicle" of Matthew of Paris (d. 1259) this characteristic vehicle of mediæval historiography became one of the most thorough and reliable sources of information available in that age.

The following were the most important of the mediæval annals. For the Carolingian period the "Greater Annals of Lorsch" and their continuation to 829 in the "Royal Annals," the "Annals of Fulda" and the excellent "Annals of Saint Bertin" and "Saint Vaast," coming down to the beginning of the 10th century, are the most valuable. The most important annals dealing with early French history are those of Flodoard (d. 966). For English mediæval history there is the above mentioned work of Roger of Hoveden coming down to 1201. For mediæval Germany the great annalistic sources are the elegantly written but prejudiced "Annals of Lambert of Hersfeld," covering the period to 1077, and the more valuable "Greater Annals of Cologne," which come to 1237.

The chronicles dealing with mediæval German history begin with those of Fredegaricus the Schoolmaster in the 7th century and of Regino of Prüm in the 10th, and include the authoritative "Chronicle" of Hermann of Reichenau (d. 1054), Ekkehard of Aurach's "Universal Chronicle," compiled at the beginning of the 12th century and the most comprehensive of all mediæval chronicles, the "Chronicle" of Otto of Freising (d. 1158), the most notable of 12th century historians, and the valuable "Chronicle" of Arnold of Lübeck (d. 1212). For France the more famous chronicles are the "Chronicle of Nantes," coming to 1049, those of Hugh of Flavigny and Sigebert of Gembloux in the 12th century and of William of Nangis at the beginning of the 14th century. The "Chronicles" of Froissart (1373 ff.) are attractive but highly colored and prejudiced and they illustrate to some extent the transition from the mediæval chronicle to the historical

narrative. For England the great mediæval chronicles are the 'Anglo-Saxon Chronicle,' describing events to 1154; Roger of Wendover's 'Flowers of History,' coming down to 1235, and their continuation to 1259 in Matthew of Paris' 'Greater Chronicle.' From Italy is the valuable and voluminous 'Florentine Chronicle' of Giovanni Villani, dealing with events to 1348.

3. Attempts at Systematic History.—The efforts to produce something like a systematic historical treatise during the mediæval period varied greatly in their success. Their nature was, on the whole, closely correlated with the changes in the general level of culture. The earliest were usually slovenly and labored in style, sadly inaccurate in grammar and entirely credulous and uncritical in method. In the latter part of the period, however, the level of scholarship was raised, and in the works of such an historian as Otto of Freising, in the middle of the 12th century, one meets for the first time with an author who will compare favorably with the second-rate figures in classical historiography. On the whole, there were few attempts at a general or international history of a period, and the histories chiefly concerned local or national events and movements or the deeds of a conspicuous national monarch.

The following were the more important works dealing with German history from the period of the "Invasions." The first of these, and the earliest product of mediæval historiography, was the 'Ten Books of Frankish History' of Gregory of Tours (540-594), which is the main source of information regarding the origin of the Merovingian dynasty. It was naïve, credulous and prejudiced against the Goths, but was an exceedingly straightforward and human document, and was based, to a considerable degree, on Gregory's direct observations. The Lombards found their national historian in Paul the Deacon (725-800), an erudite member of the group of scholars at the court of Charlemagne. His 'History of the Lombards' was greatly superior to Gregory's work with respect to both accuracy and style. The first layman to produce an historical work in the mediæval period was Nithard, whose 'Four Books of History' present an able and lucid narrative of the civil wars among the grandsons of Charlemagne and offer one of the few examples of vivid secular interests on the part of a mediæval historian. The Saxon emperors had as their dynastic historian the monk Widukind, whose 'Deeds of the Saxons' gave an able survey of the reigns of Henry I and Otto the Great. A more penetrating account of the culture of this period is found in the 'Book of Retribution,' the 'History of Otto' and the 'Legatio' of Liutprandt of Cremona (d. 973). The finest products of mediæval German historiography from the standpoint of style, accuracy and philosophic grasp were the 'Deeds of the Emperor Frederick the First' and the above mentioned 'Chronicle' of Bishop Otto of Freising (c. 1114-58). While his lack of any scientific canons of criticism, his revival of the Augustine-Orosius philosophy of history in his 'Chronicle' and his bias in favor of his royal patron all combined to prevent his ranking with the greatest historians of classical antiquity, his work illustrates the highest point to which the strictly mediæval German his-

toriography attained. The eminent authority, Wegele, says of the work of Otto: "A writer possessing such extraordinary literary talent as Otto of Freising did not appear again in German history for many a century. However much Lambert of Hersfeld may have excelled him as a polished narrator, Otto more than made up for this by the deep seriousness of his world-philosophy and the loftiness of the viewpoint which he invariably maintained. Whatever anyone may think of his philosophy, he is the only mediæval German historian who was able to grasp in a philosophical manner the march of world-history and who sought to give it a judicious exposition. And he occupies no less conspicuous a position as a narrator of the history of his own times."

For France, alleged historical works began with the prolix and highly prejudiced 'Four Books of History' of Richer, who wrote at the very close of the 10th century and is almost the sole source for the establishment of the Capetian dynasty. An even less reliable and a thoroughly mediæval work with the same title by Raoul Glaber carried the story down for a half century further. Somewhat better was the 'Gesta Dei per Francos' of Guibert of Nogent (1053-1124), which tells the story of the First Crusade, but it is based largely on an earlier Norman narrative and the author is hopelessly confused when he loses his guide. In the 12th century a superior work appeared in the lively and attractive 'Ecclesiastical History' of Ordericus Vitalis (1075-1142). Something like a real history is to be seen in Rigord's (c. 1150-1209) 'Deeds of Philip Augustus,' in the preparation of which the author made some elementary use of the available documents, letters and archives. The 'Conquête de Constantinople,' by Geoffroy de Villehardouin (c. 1160-1213), was one of the more notable historical products of the Middle Ages. It was the first mediæval historical work of any consequence which was written in the vernacular. While it was somewhat of an apology for Villehardouin's policy in the Fourth Crusade, it is much the best extant source for an interpretation of the real spirit of the Crusaders. It was a straightforward account, written in a vigorous and concise style being full of personal touches and throbbing with virile human interests. The 'Chronicles of France, England, Scotland and Spain,' originally written by Froissart (1338-1410), a 14th century Lamartine, about 1375, have been mentioned above. They were the work of a poet and chronicler and were avowedly written to "delight and please" his readers, and in this he succeeded wholly. It is episodical history at its best for literature and near its worst for history, though it is the fullest extant source for the Hundred Years' War. An incomparably superior historical work was the 'Mémoires' of Philippe de Commynes (c. 1445-1511), dealing with the period of Louis XI. It was a vigorous narrative exhibiting almost all of the traits of the true historian—a good grasp on the meaning of events, penetrating analysis of motives, a description of contemporary culture and sound generalizations. Especially did Commynes emphasize the political and pragmatic value of history and advised all statesmen and diplomats to "study it well, for it holds the master key to all types of frauds, deceptions and perjuries."

With this work French history enters on the modern period.

Aside from the above mentioned chroniclers, the avowed mediæval English historians were few. The confused and gloomy description of the invasions by Gildas (c. 516-570) has acquired an undeserved fame because of its being the only available source for that important period. A fine product of the lingering classical culture in the north of Europe is to be found in Bede's (c. 672-735) famous 'Ecclesiastical History of the English Nation.' The work of a real literary artist and scholar, it was a reminiscence of a fast passing culture rather than a promise of a new era in historiography. On the Anglo-Saxon and Norman monarchs a work of interest and merit was 'The History of the Kings of England,' by William of Malmesbury (d. 1142). It is generally agreed that the leading English mediæval historian was Matthew of Paris (d. 1259). His 'Greater Chronicle' dealt with the troubled times in the middle of the 13th century just preceding the beginnings of the English parliamentary system. The cautious English historian and critic, James Gairdner, thus summarizes the characteristics of Matthew of Paris and his historical writings: 'His narrative is plain, straightforward and lucid, with here and there a little bit of graphic description, but it contains nothing that is highly coloured or introduced as a mere embellishment. The whole interest of the history arises simply out of the facts themselves and the truthfulness with which they are depicted. The writer was far too much interested in what he had to tell to adorn it with meretricious graces. He was a politician who felt the moral significance of all that took place in his day, whether in England, at Rome, or in the distant East; and he expresses his judgment without the least reserve, alike on the acts of his own sovereign, of his countrymen, and of the court of Rome. He is, in fact, the most distinctly political historian with whom we have yet had to do. He has, no doubt, his feelings as a monk, resenting the presumption, in some cases, of these new orders of friars, though even here his complaints seem very fair. But his thoughts rise altogether above mere class and party considerations. He is not so much a monk as an English politician, and yet not English exclusively, but cosmopolitan. His merits, even in his own day, as a man of great judgment and impartiality seem to have been renowned over Europe.'

4. Mediæval Historical Biography.—The personal prowess of the great political and military figures in the Middle Ages made attractive subjects for historical biography. Often the monarch subsidized or otherwise favored a biographer to ensure a properly flattering record of his deeds. Needless to say, strict impartiality was never observed, and sycophancy often was added to the other defects of mediæval historiography. In addition, the theological coloring of all mediæval thought led the biographer to represent the great secular figures of the period as the chosen agents of Divine Providence in their age. Of these mediæval biographies the most notable were 'The Life of Charlemagne,' by Einhard; 'The Life of Louis the Fat,' by Suger; and Joinville's 'Life of Saint Louis,' one of the polished French historical works written in the vernacular. Here also

belong, almost as much as in the field of systematic history, the works of Otto of Freising and Rigord. Among these mediæval biographers, especially such as Einhard and Joinville, one finds some of the best examples of the rare emergence of secular interests in mediæval historiography.

Several facts stand out from even the foregoing brief survey of mediæval historiography. In the first place, like the most of classical historiography, the historical works of the Middle Ages were for the most part concerned with strictly contemporary history. The treatment of a remote period was almost invariably in the nature of a rude and scanty chronicle of events. In the second place, it is almost impossible to differentiate sharply between chronicles, systematic histories and biographies on account of a common methodology. Thirdly, it is noticeable that the vast majority of the writers were churchmen. Therefore, while the ecclesiastics cannot be too severely criticized for their vitiation of historical methods, it is well to remember that without them mediæval historical literature would have been practically a blank. Fourthly, it will readily be apparent that mediæval history was almost exclusively episodical, there being almost no attempt to analyze the deeper social, economic and intellectual forces in historical development. Finally, one can easily discern that, with the stimulation of intellectual interests during and following the Crusades, there came an increase in the volume of historical output and an improvement in its quality that was a prophecy of a future recovery of the lost historical standards of classical antiquity.

5. The Arabic Historians of the Middle Ages.—The contribution of the Arabs to mediæval culture was not insignificant in the field of historiography, but only a few of the more notable Arabic historians can be mentioned in this place. Orosius found his Arabian counterpart in Tabari (846-932), who compiled the first universal history from the Mohammedan point of view. The events of history were adapted to the creation of a 'Mohammedan Epic' justifying the triumph of Islam. History and ethnography were combined in the voluminous works of Mas'udi (d. 966), whose wide travels carried him over most of Asia, Africa and Europe. Not until the publication of the histories dealing with the discoveries of the 16th century was there another work which contained as much descriptive ethnographic material. The ablest contributor to historical biography among the Arabs was Ibn Khallikan (d. 1282), whom experts rank with the best biographers of classical antiquity. The first Arab historian to possess any considerable philosophic grasp upon cause and effect in historical development was Athir (1160-1232). But far and away the ablest and most significant figure in Arab historiography was Ibn Khaldun (1332-1406). His importance lies in the unique feat, for the time, of having been able to rationalize the subject of history and to reflect upon its methods and purpose. At the outset, in his 'Prolegomena to Universal History,' which was the systematic presentation of his theoretical views, he drew a sharp distinction between the conventional annalistic and episodical historical writings.

ing of his time and history as he conceived of it, as the science of the origin and development of civilization. Anticipating Vico and Turgot, he comprehended the nature of the unity and continuity of historical development. In marked contrast with the static or eschatological conceptions of contemporary Christian historiography was his dynamic thesis that the process of historic growth is subject to constant change comparable to the life of the individual organism, and he made clear the co-operation of psychic and environmental factors in this evolution of civilization. Flint makes the following estimate of the significance of his work: "The first writer to treat history as the proper object of a special science was Mohammed Ibn Khaldun. Whether on this account he is to be regarded or not as the founder of the science of history is a question as to which there may well be difference of opinion; but no candid reader of his 'Prolegomena' can fail to admit that his claim to the honor is more valid than that of any other author previous to Vico."

VIII. HUMANISM AND HISTORIOGRAPHY.

1. The Renaissance and Humanism.—Recent research and a more critical examination of the intellectual currents of European history have profoundly modified the exaggerated opinions of Burckhardt and Symonds with regard to the relation of the so-called "Renaissance" to the development of European thought. It has been shown that, at the best, this period did not mark a direct and conscious advance toward modern concepts, but was distinctly the revival of interest in an antique culture, which was in many fundamental ways opposed to the present-day outlook. This revival indirectly contributed toward the development of modern thought chiefly through its aid in breaking up the ecclesiastical "fixation" of mediæval thought and by bringing to the front again an interest in secular matters. In its broadest sense the literary phase of this movement is now conventionally designated as "Humanism," meaning by this not only a revival of interest in classical literature, but also a renewal of appreciation for the broadly human interests and outlook of pagan culture. It was primarily an emotional and intellectual reaction against the narrow and ascetic attitude of the theologians without constituting any real or conscious revolution in theology.

2. Characteristics of the Historiography of Humanism.—Though there were great differences in the quality of the product of the historians of this period, as, for instance, between the works of a Poggio and a Guicciardini, certain fundamental characteristics of the historiography of humanism were sufficiently general and universal to justify enumeration. The reaction of humanism upon historical writing was strictly in accordance with the fundamental aspects of the movement. It meant, in the first place, a search for classical texts and the comparison, criticism and improvement of those recovered. Again, it greatly reduced the element of the miraculous in historical interpretation and lessened the "emotional thrill" of the "Christian Epic." Pagan history was to some extent restored to the position from which it had been excluded by the Christian writers in general, and by Augustine and Orosius in

particular. This was due in part to the admiration of the humanists for classical culture, and in part to the fact, that for the first time since the passing of Rome, a majority of the leading historians were laymen and practical men of affairs rather than churchmen and theologians. Naturally, also, the classical models of historiography were effective in leading to an improvement in style and, what was more important, to a greater attention to political and social events and forces—it meant the re-secularization of history. A powerful impulse in this latter direction came from the beginnings of modern nationalism in the Italian city-states. Also, the criticism of literary texts produced at least an elementary sense of the value of a critical handling of historical documents. Finally, with the humanists history became more historical. With their centre of interest in the culture of a period long past, historical writing could no longer be limited entirely to contemporary history or to a mere repetition of the threadbare 'Chronicle' of Jerome. In the large, however, humanism meant to historical writing a great literary and cultural improvement but much less of an advance in scientific method—it was a great impulse to history as literature but in no such degree to history as a critical science. The canons of Isocrates, Livy and Tacitus rather than of Thucydides and Polybius, were the guide of humanist historians. Nor did humanism bring to historical writing that freedom from subserviency to vested interests and authority that is commonly supposed. It emancipated it to a large degree from the theological bias, but substituted a secular restraint which was often as damaging to objectivity and accuracy. As Professor Burr has well stated the case, "When the Middle Ages waned, the revived study of the ancients and the rise of a lay republic of letters did not at first, one must confess, greatly advance the freedom of history. The courtier humanist charged with a biography of his princely patron or a history of his dynasty, the humanist chancellor commissioned by the city fathers to write the history of the town, was perhaps less free to find or tell the truth than had been the churchly chronicler unhampered by hereditary lords or local vanity. The audience, too, was humanist, and the tyranny of rhetoric, never wholly dispelled throughout the Middle Ages, now reasserted itself with double power. It was the humanist historian's very function to make the glories of his prince or of his city a vehicle for the display of the Latin style to which he owed his post. And if history, thus again an art, a branch of literature, dared in a field so secular to shun the mention of ecclesiastical miracle and even to forget the great plan of salvation, it was too often to borrow from the ancients a strange varnish of omens and of prodigies." While it bore no causal relation to humanism, it should be remembered that it was during this period that the printing press was invented and introduced into general use. It gave a great stimulus to the "making of books" in the field of history, as in other branches of literary effort. In its largest significance for the future of historical science, the invention of printing can be compared only to the original mastery of the art of writing. It is not too much to say that neither Thucydides, Polybius, Blondus, Mabillon

nor Ranke was as consequential or indispensable in making possible the present status of historiography as the inventor of the art of printing by movable type, be he Coster, Gutenberg or someone yet to be discovered.

3. The Chief Contributors to the Historiography of Humanism.—Aside from the scholars whose activity lay solely in the search for classical texts, the first important product of humanist historiography was 'The Twelve Books of Florentine History' by Leonardo Bruni (1369-1444). In this and his later 'Commentaries' are to be found nearly all of the characteristics of the historiography of the humanist school—a moderate adherence to the canons of style of the Greek and Roman Rhetoricians, the opinion that classical rather than contemporary culture was the most promising field for historical inspiration, the elimination of pagan and Christian miracles and legends, and a primary attention to the practical analysis of political events and activities. The standards of Bruni were adopted by his Venetian disciple, Marcantonio Coccio (1436-1506), known as 'Sabellicus,' in the production of the only serious humanist attempt at a world history, his 'Enneades.' Though he took his chronology from Eusebius, he restored to the history of antiquity some degree of proportion in dealing with the various nations by departing from the almost exclusive concern with Hebrew history, which had been the fashion for a millennium. Again, while he in no way foreshadowed Voltaire, that he made some progress toward rationalism and criticism may be seen from his placing the legend of Samson on a parity with that of Hercules. The great gulf between the historiography of the Patriotic period and that of humanism can best be appreciated by a comparison of the 'Enneades' with 'The Seven Books of History against the Pagans.' If Bruni was the Herodotus of humanist historiography and Sabellicus its Diodorus, Poggio (1380-1459) was its Ephorus. His 'Eight Books of Florentine History' illustrate in its extreme form the influence of classical rhetoric on humanist historical literature and one may agree with Fueter that "what he gained as a literary artist he lost as an historian."

Of a widely different character from the work of Poggio was that of the most distinguished historical critic of the period, Laurenzius Valla (1407-57). Valla's only systematic historical work, 'The History of Ferdinand I of Aragon' was not conspicuously successful. It proved the author to be a "scandal-monger" rather than a historian in the field of narrative, though it may have been a slight methodological advance to have substituted scandals for miracles. His achievement, for which he has received undue fame in the field of criticism, was the final proof of the forgery of the 'Donation of Constantine,' the authenticity of which had already been doubted by Cusanus and Bishop Peacock. As Fueter has clearly shown, Valla acquired fame by virtue of the venerable nature of the document he attacked rather than by the skill or erudition he displayed in its analysis. It was a testimonial to his courage rather than to his critical powers, which could be matched by several other humanists. As Emerton has said, "The most interesting thing about the exposure is the amazing ease of it. It does not

prove the great learning or cleverness of the author, for neither of these was needed. The moment that the bare facts were held up to the world of scholars the whole tissue of absurdities fell to pieces of its own weight." More skill was shown in his 'Duo Tarquinii,' an attack on Livy's treatment of a certain phase of early Roman history. This work also showed that the most highly esteemed of secular authorities was no more immune from critical examination than venerable ecclesiastical documents. Valla's methods were applied by his Venetian contemporary, Bernardo Giustiniani (1408-89), to dissipate the legends connected with the founding of Venice.

Far the greatest historical scholar that Italian humanism produced was Flavio Blondus (1388-1463), the Timaeus of humanism, who devoted his life to a study of the antiquities of ancient Rome and the rise of the mediaeval states. His chief work was 'History since the Decline of the Power of the Romans,' in 31 books. The most notable thing about this work, aside from the careful scholarship, was the original attitude that its author displayed in his interpretation of the significance of the mediaeval period. "The novel element in the attitude of Blondus," says Professor Burr, "is that instead of thinking of the Middle Ages as the continuous history of a Roman Empire, as mediaevals had been wont to do, he left Rome to the past and told the story of the rising peoples who supplanted her." "He contributed more," says Fueter, "to our knowledge of the Middle Ages and of Roman antiquity than all the other humanists combined." It is the best possible illustration of the canons of humanism that its greatest historical scholar and *savant* was never given formal recognition or reward for his great contribution to scholarship, because he did not possess an elegant literary style. In a more fundamental sense, perhaps, his work was given the greatest testimonial possible, in that, of all products of the historical scholarship of the period, it was the most plagiarized for information by later writers. In this way it contributed indirectly to the improvement of historical scholarship. The unpopularity of scholarship for its own sake, as shown by the experience of Blondus, explains why he had but one true Italian disciple, Calchi (1462-c.1516), the historian of Milan. Blondus was the true precursor of Mabillon and Tillemont.

The humanist Pope, Eneas Sylvius Piccolomini (1405-64), deserves mention in a sketch of humanist historiography more from the nature of his personal career and the influence he exerted on later German writers than from the value of his contributions to systematic history or to the improvement of historical method. His numerous historical works, 'Commentaries on the Council of Basel'; 'The History of Frederick III'; 'The History of Bohemia'; 'The History of Europe'; 'Universal History,' and 'Commentaries,' or his autobiography, were superficial, without deep philosophical grasp, fragmentary and incomplete. Contrary to the usual view, he did not even equal Bruni as an historical critic, to say nothing of Valla and Blondus. On the other hand, he was a man of action in politics to a degree scarcely equalled by Polybius or Tacitus. No contemporary knew more of

European politics and culture than he, and the most valuable aspect of his historical works is the fact that they are full of personal memoirs. As a member of the imperial chancery of Frederick III and through his later ecclesiastical relations with the empire, his interest in German history and culture was greater than that of any of his Italian contemporaries. His significance in the development of historiography rests primarily upon his works on German history and his influence on later German historians. In his history of Frederick III he made large use of Otto of Freising and brought him to the attention of contemporaries. His history of Bohemia was probably the first attempt of a humanist historian to introduce ethnography into historical literature. Finally, his history of Europe and his universal history sought to bring out the interrelation between history and geography. It was in these respects, chiefly, that he influenced later German historians. Fueter says on this point: "Æneas Sylvius was mainly responsible for the later appearance in the works of many German humanist historians of the tendency to introduce into works on history excursions into the origin and growth of law and the relations of geography to historical development, to assume at least a semi-critical attitude toward the legends of racial origins, and to display a boisterous chauvinism in matters touching the question of nationality."

Historical biography among the humanists was founded by Filippo Villani (c.1325-1405) in his survey of the most illustrious citizens of Florence. Always handicapped by the crudeness of their classical model, Suetonius, the biographical products of the period were not as successful as the more systematic historical works. The only notable work was Giorgio Vasari's (1511-1574) 'Lives of the Most Eminent Painters, Sculptors and Architects.' This lacks almost every characteristic of a good historical work, but has become famous because of its subject matter and the scarcity of other sources. It was the first real history of art.

The transition from strictly humanist historiography to the beginnings of modern political and national historical writing in Italy was well illustrated by the works of the Florentine historians, Machiavelli and Guicciardini. The cultural supremacy of Florence at the time, and the intensity of its political life, combined to make it a particularly favorable environment to stimulate the production of works of high value. With Blondus they valued truth more than rhetoric, but they were saved from the former's obscurity and unpopularity by avoiding a labored and pedantic style. With them history became wholly secular and was limited primarily to a straight-forward narrative and analysis of political events. Some attempt also was made to substitute a psychological and material theory of causation for supernaturalism.

Machiavelli (1469-1527) was primarily a political philosopher without any particular emotion for history unless it was utilized in the interests of political theory. It is this tendency which gives his major historical work, 'The History of Florence,' its distinctive characteristics. From the standpoint of style or accuracy it was not superior to some other histories of the period, but is it doubtful if any previous

historian since Polybius, with whom Machiavelli was thoroughly familiar, had exhibited the power of grasping the nature of historical causation or of presenting a clear picture of the process of historical development that Machiavelli displayed in his analysis of the political evolution of the city of Florence. It was as a political thinker and organizer of causal factors that Machiavelli excelled, and not as an objective narrator of political events.

Not at all philosophical, but more truly historical, was Guicciardini (1483-1540). His 'History of Florence' is one of the truly original works in historiography in that the author broke almost completely with both Patristic and humanist historiography and even went beyond the classical historical conventions in one particular, namely, that he eliminated the introduction of direct discourse in his narrative. In his lucid style, free from digressions and irrelevant details, there was no trace of florid rhetoric, and his primary concern with contemporary political history allowed him, in the latter part of the work, to dispense, to some extent, with the annalistic and strictly chronological arrangement of the conventional historical writing of his time. He made no attempt at philosophic analysis, but devoted himself solely to a vigorous and incisive narrative of events and a candid criticism of men and policies. "With the 'Florentine History,'" says Fueter, "there began modern analytical historiography and political ratio-cinication in history." Most critics contend that with Guicciardini's 'History of Florence' historiography in western Europe had again attained to the level of Thucydides and Polybius. It had, however, no influence on contemporary historiography as it was not published until 1859. From the standpoint of style and arrangement Guicciardini's other major work, 'The History of Italy,' was less original because here he compromised with those rhetorical conventions of humanism which he had so rigorously excluded from his first work. But with respect to its breadth, scope and original mode of approach, the latter work was even more epoch making. For the first time a historian had been able to break with tradition and free himself from primary concern with any particular state or dynasty and to devote his attention to a much broader field — "the history of a geographical unity." This gave him an unprecedented opportunity to study the growth and decline of states, the interaction between states in all the phases of international relations, and the processes of political evolution. In other words, the subject-matter offered rare opportunities for the study of universal history reproduced on a small scale, and, though Guicciardini almost entirely lacked that philosophical insight into social and political processes that distinguished Machiavelli and was thereby prevented from making the first great study of social and political evolution, the very novelty of his program constituted a great advance in historical method. Few will deny that Guicciardini reached the highest level to which post-classical historiography attained until the time of Mabillon, but the great progress that was necessary before modern scientific political history could be reached is best appreciated by a perusal of the rather over severe criticism of Guicciardini by Ranke, the earliest, but by no means the most cautious and scholarly of the

modern school. The modern standards might more quickly have been reached had not the Reformation set back the progress of historical writing by the resurrection of theological interests and religious bias and controversy which humanism was gradually and peacefully smothering. Not until the theological monopoly had been crushed by the rationalism of the 18th century and secular interests had been reinforced by the commercial revolution and the rise of modern nations could any fundamental advance be achieved.

Outside of Italy, humanism found many distinguished converts, and not the least of them in the field of history. In general, the conventional canons of humanist historiography were faithfully followed, though there were some variations introduced as a result of changing conditions. As the movement was somewhat belated beyond the Alps, it became complicated by the religious conflicts of the Reformation period and took on a concern with ecclesiastical matters which was quite foreign to the Italians of the 15th century. Again, the literary tastes remained less purely classical, and, in the zeal for florid rhetoric and sharp invective, Tacitus, rather than Livy, became the model of many of the northern humanists in the 16th century. As in Italy, so in the north, humanist historical literature gradually evolved into the beginnings of modern political historiography.

The most scholarly product of the historiography of Swiss humanism was the history of Saint-Gall by Joachim von Watt, better known as Vadianus (1484-1551). He is generally rated as a historian superior to Blondus. He not only rivalled Blondus in textual criticism, but also advanced a step further toward Ranke by making some rudimentary progress toward the internal criticism of the tendencies of the authors of the documents. He was able, further, to combine erudition with a clear and vigorous style and good grasp upon the general factors of historical development. Fueter regards his work as the most broadly conceived product of the historiography of humanism on account of the wide scope of the subjects and interests embraced. It was, however, doomed to an even longer period of obscurity than awaited Guicciardini's 'History of Florence,' because it was not published until the third quarter of the 19th century.

In Germany the list of distinguished humanist historians begins with the name of Albert Krantz (1450-1517), who, following Aeneas Sylvius, was one of the first to apply the literary and historical methods of humanism to a study of primitive peoples, in his histories of the early Saxons and Wends. More famous was Johannes Turmair, known as Aventinus (1477-1534). In his 'History of Bavaria' and his 'History of Early Germany' he tried to combine the literary canons of Bruni with the scholarship of Blondus, but fell far short of either, and his bitter Protestant bias prevented any objective treatment of contemporary affairs. Few writers of the period, however, equalled him in his ability to analyze and interpret the manners and customs of a people. Ulrich von Hutten (1488-1523) was more distinguished for his brilliant satire in his campaign against bigotry than for his contributions to historical

literature, but his recovery and publication, with extended comments, of a manifesto of Henry IV against Gregory VII was both a shaft of Protestantism against Rome and a valuable addition to historical knowledge. The only distinguished representative of the erudite and critical tendencies of Blondus among the German humanist historians was Beatus Rhenanus (1486-1547), the friend and disciple of Erasmus. He examined the sources of early German history with the same exact and objective scholarship that Erasmus had applied to the ecclesiastical records and doctrines. While he lacked the ability to organize his work into a coherent exposition of its results, his labors represent the highest level of scholarship to which the historiography of German humanism attained. Of all the publicists who have a place in the historiography of German humanism, Samuel Pufendorf (1632-94) was the leader as a historian. His works included a 'History of Sweden,' a 'History of Frederick William the Great Elector' and 'An Introduction to the History of the Leading Powers and States of Europe.' He had a fine classical style, but exhibited to its fullest extent that fundamental fault still common to publicists when they enter the field of historical literature, namely, a concern only with the few distinguished figures in international relations and with that hitherto most superficial field of political history, the record of international relations when unaccompanied by any attention to internal political or social history. As in the later work of Droysen, one searches in vain in the mass of references to external politics for even the slightest appreciation of those deeper popular movements and forces of which diplomatic history can give only the most scanty and unreliable reflection and information.

A more distinguished scholar and publicist than Pufendorf, but not so noted an historian, was the Dutch writer, Hugo Grotius (1583-1645), the founder of modern international law. His chief historical work was 'The History of the Netherlands.' Though his style, in imitation of Tacitus, was pompous, prolix and involved, he displayed great ability in psychological analysis and in dissecting the problems of military and political history connected with the struggle between Spain and the Netherlands.

That humanist historiography in England was closely related to the origins of that intellectual movement in Italy is to be seen in the fact that the first product of this type of historical literature in England was the scholarly and well-written 'History of England in the Reign of Henry VII' by Polydore Vergil (1470-1535), an Italian ecclesiastic who had made his home in England. His scholarship was not matched in the British Isles until the time of Camden, a century later. England's earliest native humanist historian of note was Sir Thomas More (1478-1535), whose polished style found expression in his 'History of Richard III.' Of all the British historians of this period, it is probable that the truest representative of humanism was the erudite Scot, George Buchanan (1506-82). Few of the best Italians equalled him for the purity of his Latin diction and the vigor and clarity of his narrative, but his 'History of Scotland' was

most uncritical and credulous, utterly lacking in rationalistic tendencies and marred by a narrow chauvinism. Machiavelli and Guicciardini found their English disciple in the philosopher and statesman, Francis Bacon (1561-1626). His 'History of the Reign of King Henry the Seventh' was especially notable for bold criticism, "judicial severity," and the frank expression of the author's opinions. The English representative of the erudite and critical school of Blondus was the court historian, William Camden (1551-1623), an avowed admirer of Polybius. In his 'Annals of English and Irish History in the Reign of Elizabeth' he showed, like his French contemporary De Thou, that the political history of the 16th century could not be wholly divorced from ecclesiastical questions.

The transition from humanism to modern political history in England was illustrated by the works of Lord Clarendon (1609-74) and Bishop Burnet (1643-1715). While the general arrangement of Clarendon's 'History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England' resembled the French "memoirs," and though it was most superficial in its analysis of the fundamental social and political causes of the civil wars, it is doubtful if any previous historian, classical or humanist, possessed Clarendon's power of vivid delineation of personalities. Bishop Burnet, in his 'History of the Reformation of the Church of England' and 'History of My Own Time,' was the first historian of party intrigues and parliamentary debates, a subject scarcely available for any previous writer. An ardent Whig and Anglican, he belonged more to the forerunners of modern political history than to the list of disciples of humanism.

Spain contributed three important figures to humanist historical literature in Diego Hurtado de Mendoza (1503-75), Juan de Mariana (1535-1625) and Gerónimo de Zurita (1512-80). While Mendoza wrote his 'History of the War with Granada' in a pompous, archaic and involved style, he equalled Bacon or Guicciardini in his sharp criticisms and acute judgments. Mariana, a Spanish Jesuit, was a writer of quite a different sort. He has been called the Spanish Buchanan, and his 'History of Spain' in 30 books resembled the work of the Scot in its excellent style and cautious criticisms of Christian legends. His liberal allotment of space to ecclesiastical matters was a breach with humanist conventions. Much less able in narration, but a far more critical scholar, was Gerónimo de Zurita, the historian of the kingdom of Aragon and the most prominent and faithful disciple of Blondus among the Spanish historians of this period. He was especially significant through the fact that he was one of the first historians to make an extensive and fairly critical use of the diplomatic correspondence in reconstructing the record of political events in the distant past.

The most notable product of the historical scholarship of the French humanists was the work of Joseph Justus Scaliger (1540-1609) in the field of historical chronology. His 'De emendatione temporum' was a bold attempt to put chronology on a scientific basis by revising the "sacred" chronology in the light of the evidence from the history of the "gentile" and

"pagan" nations of antiquity. His 'Thesaurus temporum' was a most notable performance of scholarship, which provided a general history of the development of chronology and included a most valuable reconstruction of the lost 'Chronicle' of Eusebius. Scaliger's publicist contemporary, Jean Bodin (1530-96), in his 'Methodus ad faciem historiarum cognitionem,' produced the first extensive treatise on historical method, with the emphasis on interpretation rather than upon criticism of sources. Especially significant was the emphasis which Bodin placed upon the influence of geographical factors in historical development, thus opening the way for Montesquieu and Ritter. It was, therefore, to a much greater degree a forerunner of the first chapter of Buckle's 'History of England' than of Bernheim's 'Lehrbuch.' A widely different contribution to historiography was contained in the work of Jacques Auguste de Thou (1553-1617), conventionally known as Thuanus. He was probably the most notable French contributor to the systematic historiography of humanism. His 'Historia sui temporis,' designed as a continuation of a work of the same title by the Italian humanist, Paulus Iovus (1483-1552), described the civil and religious wars in France in the latter part of the 16th century according to the spirit of an enlightened and tolerant French Protestant. He introduced into historiography the laudable tendencies displayed by his royal master and friend, Henry IV, in statesmanship. As might be expected in the work of one of the jurists who aided in drafting the "Edict of Nantes," he was scarcely fair to the extreme Catholic party, but his message was a lofty and noble plea for mutual religious toleration in the larger interests of France. His work exhibited great powers of extended intellectual labor and uniformly maintained a great dignity of tone. He might have equalled Machiavelli and Guicciardini if he had not reintroduced the theory of the divine determination of political causation, and if he had possessed the constructive literary ability which would have enabled him to organize his work into a coherent narrative. He may be said, however, to have improved upon them in one regard, namely, that he showed how essential a proper consideration of ecclesiastical affairs may be to a thorough understanding of political and constitutional development. The contributions of de Thou's contemporary, Isaac Casaubon, will be discussed in another connection. The finest literary product of the historiography of French humanism was the polished 'Mémoires' of Saint-Simon (1675-1755) dealing with France under the early Bourbons.

IX. THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION AND THE COUNTER-REFORMATION IN HISTORIOGRAPHY.

1. *Its Effect upon the Subject-matter and the Interpretation of History.*—In the same year that Machiavelli received his commission to write his 'History of Florence' Luther burned the papal bull at Wittenberg and the Protestant Reformation was soon in full swing. A rude shock was given to the great impulse of humanism toward the healthy secularization of historical literature, and the centre of historical interests was again forced back into the rut of theological controversies from which

it had been trying to free itself since the days of Augustine and Orosius.⁷ Again to quote from Professor Burr, "To the freedom of history there came a sudden check with the great religious reaction we call the Reformation. Once more human affairs sank into insignificance. Less by far than that of the older church did the theology of Luther or Calvin accord reality of worth to human effort. Luther valued history, it is true, but only as a divine lesson; and Melanchton set himself to trace in it the hand of God, adjusting all its teachings to the need of Protestant dogma. Had either Papist or Lutheran brought unity to Christendom, history again must have become the handmaid of theology."⁸ Not only were ecclesiastical matters, dealing with both dogma and organization, deemed the all essential sphere of historical investigation, but also universal history was again regarded as purely a great struggle between God and the Devil. Two new "Cities of Satan," however, replaced the pagan "City" of Augustine and Orosius,—the "Teufels Nest zu Rom," and the followers of "the crazy Monk of Wittenberg," respectively. The struggle was now limited to Christendom, which became "a house divided against itself."

It is scarcely necessary to point out the fact that this revival of the religious orientation of historical interest was as fatal to the fine objectivity of Guicciardini's type of historical product as it was to the maintenance of the secular point of view of the Florentine school. There was no longer any thought of prosecuting historical studies for the mere love of acquiring information or of enriching the store of knowledge regarding the past, as Blondus had labored for these purposes alone.⁹ History again became as violently pragmatic as with Augustine and his disciples. The past was viewed merely as a vast and varied "arsenal" from which the controversialists could bring unlimited supplies of ammunition for the conflict and put their enemies to an inglorious rout. The embryonic canons of criticism which had been in part restored by the best of the humanist historians were lightly ignored, and each party consciously strove to produce the most biased account of past events possible, in order to exhibit their opponents in the most unfavorable light.

Sources of information were not valued for their authenticity, but for their potential aid in polemic exercises, and invective replaced the calm historical narrative. Finally, it should be emphasized that since the period of the Reformation there has been little opportunity for a completely free and impartial study of the mediaeval period. An epoch, the interpretation of which was so vital to the two great religious groups of Christendom, could scarcely again become a field for calm and dispassionate analysis.

It would be inaccurate, however, to hold that the Reformation gave no impulse to historical investigation. Never in the palmiest days of classical or humanist historical writing was there a more feverish energy exhibited in scanning the records of the past; the great defect was not in the nature of a decline in activity or interest, but in the character of the impulse that led to this vigorous quest for information and the manner of use to which the knowledge was put after it had been acquired.

Protestant historians were "aided by the God of Saint Paul" in the search for evidence that would prove beyond a shadow of doubt that the elaborate ritual and body of dogma of the Roman Catholic Church had been wholly an extra-scriptural and semi-pagan growth, and that the Pope was the real Anti-Christ; and Catholic investigators were "specially guided by the Blessed Virgin" in their counter-demonstration that the Church and all its appurtenances were but the rich and perfect fulfillment of Scripture, and that the Protestants were inviting a most dreadful and certain punishment by their presumptuous and sinful defection from the organization founded by Saint Peter in direct obedience to the words of Christ. The only real contributions made by the controversy were the recovery and publication of important early documents on Church history and the production of telling criticisms by both factions which could be combined a century later by the rationalists to their mutual discomfiture.

2. The Chief Products of the Controversial Period.—The first serious contribution of the Protestant camp was 'The Lives of the Popes of Rome' by Robert Barnes (1495-1540), an Anglican Lutheran who had fled to Germany for protection. Composed under Luther's direct supervision, it endeavored to prove the popes responsible for all the disasters of the Middle Ages and praised the virtues of their secular opponents. At last, the methods of Orosius had been turned against the Church itself. Much more important were the voluminous 'Magdeburg Centuries,' a composite work planned and edited by Matthias Vlach (1520-75), better known by his latinized name of Flacius. He was aided by a number of prominent Protestant scholars, such as Aleman, Copus, Wigand and Judex. The history of the Church and of Christian doctrine was reviewed by centuries down to 1300 in the effort to prove direct historicity in the Lutheran position and to show that the Catholic doctrines and organization had been an exotic and unholy growth away from the purity of Apostolic Christianity. While the authors displayed considerable critical ability in dissecting the papal doctrine and dogmas, they exhibited an equal gullibility in accepting preposterous tales to bolster up their side of the controversy.¹⁰ Its significance lies chiefly in the fact that it founded Church history in its modern phase. Another Protestant polemic appeared about this time in England and met with great popular success. This was 'The Acts and Monuments of the Christian Martyrs,' by the Englishman, John Foxe (1516-87). Beginning with Wycliffe, it traced the record of Protestant martyrs in such manner as especially to represent the struggle as one between the purity and the perversion of Christianity—between Christ and the Anti-Christ. Protestantism found its Scottish champion in John Knox (1505-72), who wrote his 'History of the Reformation in Scotland' to prove the particular solicitude of the Devil for the welfare of the Catholic cause. In spite of its obvious bias, however, Knox's work was greatly superior to that of the Centurians and Foxe. From the standpoint of literary quality, his history was a work of genius, "displaying a marvelous precision and sureness in the selection and presentation of the significant and striking details." Nor did he fail to condemn

in the most vigorous terms those who adopted Calvinism as a means of gaining selfish material ends or resorted to violence in the name of religion in order to revenge political or personal grievances. A work which can scarcely be regarded as a part of the campaign of theological polemic that is being described, but which calls for some brief notice on account of its great interest and significance for the history of the Reformation, is the "Commentaries on the Political and Religious Conditions in the Reign of Emperor Charles V" by Johannes Philippi (1506-66), more generally known by his latinized name of Sledanus. The great importance of his work is that it was the first political analysis of the Reformation movement and the Protestant revolt. He was the official constitutional apologist of the Lutheran states of northern Germany, and his task, not unlike that of Jefferson, was to justify at the bar of public opinion the entire legality of the secession of the Protestant princes from the Empire. He, therefore, approached the history of the movement from a political and constitutional rather than a theological point of view. While he limited himself wholly to authentic documents, his work was the product of an advocate; though not a polemic, it was a lawyer's brief, carefully selecting and marshalling the evidence to be presented. As might be expected from such circumstances, his "Commentaries" exhibited great power in the organization and concentration of material, an admirable lucidity of expression and a dignified tone, designed to make an appeal to the learned public of Europe. While it contained none of Ranke's religious fervor and in no way anticipated the social studies of Janssen, his work was of the greatest significance as a direct foreshadowing of the now generally accepted thesis of Professor Robinson that the Protestant revolt was far more a political than a religious movement—that it looked more toward the political adjustments of the Peace of Augsburg and the Treaty of Westphalia than to the triumph of the theology of "justification by faith." He anticipated this interpretation, not only through the general mode of his approach to the problem, but also by specific comments upon the underlying political causes of the revolt.

The Catholic counter-blast was initiated by the monumental 'Annales ecclesiastici' of Cardinal Caesar Baronius (1538-1607), the director of the Vatican library. By the use of an enormous mass of evidence he tried to prove the New Testament origin of Catholic Christianity and to show its logical development from Scriptural foundations. While he was more critical in his use of sources than the authors of the 'Centuries' and introduced more unpublished documents, the work was purely a polemic and marked no advance in historical method. In one way it was decidedly a retrogression. As the most authoritative critic of the historiography of this period has clearly shown, Baronius was mainly responsible for the introduction into historical controversy of the method of shuffling, quibbling and evasion, which has particularly characterized the Jesuit controversialists. He endeavored to avoid meeting dangerous issues by trying to confuse and obscure the vital question through turning the discussion into secon-

dary and irrelevant channels. The crudities and errors in the work of Baronius were revealed in the searching criticism of the great humanist scholar, Isaac Casaubon (1559-1614), to whom Baronius' weaknesses due to his inability to handle Greek were readily apparent. He devoted the last years of his life to a refutation of Baronius in his 'Exercitationes in Baronium.' The 'Annales' were later continued with much greater scholarship by Odoricus Raynaldus (1595-1671), a learned Italian ecclesiastic. The second great Catholic champion was the French bishop, Jacques Bénigne Bossuet (1627-1704). In his 'History of the Differences among the Protestant Churches' he endeavored to convince the Protestants of the error of their ways by showing them that there could be no logical end to sectarian divisions once the crucial initial break had been made with ecclesiastical authority. Bossuet's importance lies in the fact that he alone of the controversialists, Protestant or Catholic, was able to get beneath personalities and events and to view the conflict in its deepest philosophical aspects as a struggle between liberty and authority, in which the victory of liberty meant to him indifference, atheism and religious anarchy. In his 'Discourse on Universal History' he appeared as the Orosius of the Counter-Reformation. Though incomparably more able and philosophic than the 'Seven Books against the Pagans,' it was less critical and less historical than the 'Enneades' of Sabellicus. "His 'Discourse,'" says Fueter, "was not an historical work." It was merely a sermon in which the biblical text was supplanted by historical subject-matter carefully edited and prepared in the interest of the Church." It was the last serious attempt at an interpretation of universal history in terms of the old theology. After Voltaire had published his 'Essai sur les Mœurs' in the middle of the next century, no one dared to risk his reputation by a revival of the doctrines of Orosius and Bossuet.

The above-mentioned works of controversy are only the more notable ones selected from the great volume of lesser contributions to the historical literature of the Reformation and Counter-Reformation, but they sufficiently illustrate the general tendencies in method and interpretation. It has not entirely ceased at the present day as one can readily perceive by a comparison of the works of Ranke and Schaff with those of Döllinger and Janssen. While humanists and religious controversialists were writing, a new Europe was being shaped by the effects of the commercial revolution, out of which was to come modern civilization and with it the birth of scientific historiography.

X. THE CHIEF INFLUENCES IN THE SHAPING OF MODERN HISTORIOGRAPHY.

1. **The Era of Discoveries and the "Commercial Revolution."**—Inasmuch as history down to very recent times has been regarded as primarily the domain and province of the theologian or *littérateur*, it was but natural that either the Reformation or the Renaissance should be taken as marking the origin of the modern phase of the development of historiography. Now that it has come to be generally conceded that, in its broadest interpretation, history is a branch of social science and related

generically to the whole body of science, it has become necessary to search for the causes which brought modern historical writing into being in the results of that great period of transformation which marks the beginnings of the present social and intellectual order, namely, the "Commercial Revolution." By this term is meant that vast movement of exploration and discovery, which occurred in the three centuries from 1450-1750, and its almost incalculable social and intellectual consequences. The isolation, repetition, stability and provincialism of the old order could not endure in the face of the widespread contact of different cultures—that most potent of all forces in arousing intellectual curiosity and promoting radical changes of every sort.

The reaction of the commercial revolution upon historiography was in no way more notable and far-reaching than in regard to the scope of the historian's interest. The narrowness and superficiality of the field of historical investigation since the canons of Thucydides and Orosius had come to prevail could no longer endure unimpaired. It meant the beginning of the return to the field that Herodotus had to some extent marked out for the historian. Writers to some degree ceased to be absorbed by those most superficial phases of political and ecclesiastical history, which had hitherto claimed all of their attention, and became for the first time interested in the totality of civilization. It meant a much greater impulse to that broadening and secularizing process which had been revived by humanism. Not only were there great stores of knowledge to be obtained from the contact with the older civilizations of the East, but in the natives, historians and philosophers at last found the "natural man," who had hitherto only existed in the mythical period before the "Flood." No greater contrast could be imagined than the vast difference in the type of subjects which interested such an historian as Pufendorf and those with which Oviedo concerned himself. Again, the new range of historical interests offered some opportunity for originality of thought; there were fewer erroneous notions to handicap the writer at the outset. Neither Thucydides, Polybius and Livy, nor Augustine and Aquinas had provided the final authoritative opinion on the marriage customs of Borneo or the kinship system of the Iroquois. The only exception in this respect was the prevalent doctrine of a "state of nature," which had come down from the Stoics and Roman lawyers and now seemed to have practical concrete confirmation.

While the influence of the commercial revolution upon historiography was most effective indirectly, through the intellectual and social changes which it produced, and the reaction of these changes upon historical interests and methods, there were some important immediate and direct results apparent in historical writing among those who dealt with the record of the discoveries. In the first place, there were radical changes in style and exposition. The old arrangement in the form of annals was no longer suitable; what was needed now was a vehicle for comprehensive description and not for chronological narration. The majority of the early historians of the movement of exploration and discovery were practical men of affairs and wrote in a direct and unpretentious

style. Though there was later, with such writers as Herrera, a tendency to lapse into the literal canons of humanism, an important breach had already been made with both the form and the style of the conventional historical literature. The content of historical products was also greatly altered by these writers; political and ecclesiastical intrigues were replaced by a comprehensive account of the manners and customs of a people. This tendency reacted strongly even on those writers who dealt exclusively with European affairs. The 'Chronicle' of Eusebius or the genealogy of reigning monarchs, as the introduction to historical works was generally displaced by a description of the land and its inhabitants. Excepting only the feeble advances of *Æneas Sylvius* and his numerous German disciples, for the first time since the days of the Ionic historians of the 5th and 6th centuries B.C., ethnography and geography began to make a feeble appearance in historiography. Finally, though the earlier of the members of this school of writers were primarily collectors of descriptive information, they later became speculative, and with Voltaire and Herder there appear attempts at a world history conceived according to the new orientation and possessing some degree of comprehensiveness and grasp of causal forces.

As historiography was completely dominated by the canons of humanism at the beginning of the period of discovery, it was natural that the earliest of the historians of the commercial revolution should be humanists who turned their attention to the new movement. Their style and arrangement of material, however, had to be altered to some extent, and the centre of interest was profoundly changed. The first of these writers was *Peter Martyr d'Anghiera* (d. 1520), an Italian humanist who devoted himself to a description of the new world which had just been revealed. His 'Decades of the New World' showed a fine power of descriptive composition, which sacrificed humanist conventions when necessary. While exhibiting no profundity and little critical ability, it was a well-proportioned and fairly complete summary of the extant reports regarding the new civilizations. Its great significance lies in the fact that it was the first work by an historian which described the civilization of a people without founding it upon the narrow and cramped basis of political life or religious activities. A more truly historical work and the most objective production of the period was the 'General and Natural History of the Indies' of *Gonzalo Fernández de Oviedo* (1478-1557), a Spanish naturalist who turned historian—a sort of early Alfred Russell Wallace. He was highly critical in recording his own observations, but was equally credulous in accepting tales told to him by others. His work contained a vast amount of information which was generally reliable. In his direct and matter-of-fact narrative there was nothing of the form of humanism, but his style was slovenly and the organization of material miserable. It was the least artistic and the most scientific work of this early group. At the opposite pole as to accuracy stood the notorious work of the Dominican bishop, *Bartholomew de Las Casas* (1474-1566)—the "William Lloyd Garrison of the 16th century." He was a biased and pedantic scholastic doctrinaire of a thoroughly mediæval type. His 'History of the

Indies,' idealized the natives without bounds and tremendously exaggerated the cruelty of the conquerors. It was worse than worthless for either history or ethnography and did not even possess the merit of an agreeable style. Infinitely superior was the 'General History of the Indies' of Francisco López de Gómara (1510-c.1560), the ablest historian of this school. He showed an admirable combination of excellent descriptive style with relatively high critical ability. His work would have been the great history of the discoveries had it not been vitiated by personal considerations. He was employed by the family of Cortés and was compelled to devote more space to the history of the conquest of Mexico than to all other events combined, and was also compelled to refrain from candid criticism in this major portion of his work. The great "popular" history of the period of discovery was the 'General History of the West Indies' of Antonio de Herrera (1549-1625), the official historian of Philip II. This work was the best example of the lapse of the early descriptive narrative into the conventions of humanist style. He even adopted the annalistic arrangement and everywhere subordinated subject-matter to external form. This meant that his work was greatly inferior to some of the earlier ones in its descriptive material as well as in critical method. It became the popular authority and did more than any other work to establish the generally accepted ideas concerning the discoveries and the great figures connected with them. Next to the work of Las Casas the least meritorious product of this school was the 'Commentaries on the Incas,' by Garcilaso de la Vega (1540-1616), the son of a Spanish adventurer by a native Peruvian mother. He was honest but entirely destitute of critical powers. Adopting the style of the humanists, he constructed an utopian picture of ancient Peru which was exaggerated beyond comparison. His almost worthless picture of the Incas gained great vogue in the 17th and 18th centuries when such idealistic views of native populations were so popular. In passing, there might be mentioned the bumptious and boastful 'General History of Virginia and New England' by Capt. John Smith. The first work to deal with the exploration and settlement of India and the "Far East" by Europeans was the 'Da Asia,' of the Portuguese colonial official and historian, João de Barros (1496-1570). Published in fragmentary form in 1552, it described the Portuguese explorations in Asia. It was, perhaps, the best literary product among the histories of the period of discovery, and, though somewhat apologetic in tone, remained for a long time the chief source of information on the subject. A century and a half later Engelbrecht Kaempfer (1651-1716) provided the first systematic account of the early European contact with Japan. He was a German physician who visited Japan and his manuscript 'History of Japan,' published in 1727, remained the chief popular source of European knowledge regarding that country for a century, and was extensively used by Charlevoix. The French Jesuit, Pierre François Xavier de Charlevoix (1682-1761), not only compiled histories of the Jesuit missionary enterprises in Japan on the basis of the works of Kaempfer and others, but also wrote voluminously of the French ex-

plorations in America from personal observation and first hand contact. His 'Histoire et description générale de la Nouvelle-France' (1744), though prolix and uncritical, was highly interesting and enjoyed a long popularity. The general reaction of the influences growing out of the period of discoveries and the commercial revolution upon this school of historians was best summed up in 'The Philosophical and Political History of the Settlements and Trade of Europeans in the East and West Indies,' by the promoter and pamphleteer, Guillaume Thomas Raynal (1713-96). Published in 1771, it was not only somewhat of a synthetic compilation from earlier works, but also indicated the reaction of the commercial revolution upon European thought by its emphasis upon the significance of commerce in modern history and by its surcharge of 18th century political philosophy concerning the rights of man, liberty and the state of nature. But important as some of these writers may have been in altering the conventions of style and the interests of the historian, the general effect of the commercial revolution upon historiography was less vital in the production of historians of the discoveries than in the alteration of all phases of life in the succeeding centuries which grew more or less directly out of it and indirectly wrought great changes in historical concepts and methods.

2. The Reaction of the New Scientific Philosophy upon Historiography.—None of the indirect influences of the commercial revolution upon historical writing were more important and more obvious than its aid in introducing that new philosophy of nature of which Bacon and Descartes were the most conspicuous exponents. The results of the explorations of all the major portions of the earth's surface had not only demonstrated the great extent of the habitable portions of the globe, but had also shown that the supposed marvels and terrors in the unexplored regions were but an unfounded myth which quite failed to materialize. At the same time that De Gama, Columbus and Magellan were revealing the extent and nature of the surface of the globe, less picturesque figures were devoting themselves to an exploration of the universe, with results equally disastrous to the older theological traditions. The vast and immeasurable extent of the universe was apprehended to an elementary degree by Copernicus, Galileo and Tycho Brahe. The notion of an orderly arrangement and functioning of the universe was established by the great laws of mechanics, discovered and formulated by Galileo, Kepler and Newton. To these major advances in science should be added the explanation of the now commonplace natural phenomena through the great advances in every field of natural science in the 17th century. The net result of all these notable advances was a serious challenge to the old theological interpretations, based primarily upon the concept of a "God of arbitrariness," who was continually varying or suspending the laws of the universe to punish a recalcitrant prince or to answer the prayer of a faithful bishop.

The general implications of the above scientific discoveries were reduced to a systematic body of philosophical thought by Francis Bacon and René Descartes. Bacon especially emphasized the necessity of following the inductive

method and Descartes attempted a mechanical interpretation of the universe. The new discoveries and the new philosophy tended to produce a rationalistic interpretation of natural and social phenomena which abruptly challenged the older and generally accepted view of miracles and wonders that had been so popular with Christian historians during the mediæval period. The English Deists, such as Cherbury, Blount, Locke, Shaftesbury, Woolston and Hume, forever discredited the doctrine of the miraculous. Finally, with the attacks upon the traditional views of the composition of the Old and New Testaments by Hobbes, Spinoza, Astruc and Reimarus, the philosophy of wonder-working was undermined, not only through the evidence of natural science, but by questioning the authenticity of the Scriptural accounts in which the miracles were recorded. The gradual growth of toleration, especially in England, during the latter part of the 17th century and the opening of the 18th centuries enabled these revolutionary ideas to obtain an adequate expression and a general currency.

It was also inevitable that the new scientific discoveries and the new philosophy of nature should react profoundly upon the contemporary social philosophy. The idea of orderly development and continuity in social as well as natural processes was comprehended by Vico, Hume and Turgot. The older idea of social evolution as a gradual decline or retrogression from a primordial "golden age" was replaced in the writings of Vico, Voltaire, Hume, Turgot, Kant, Godwin and Condorcet by the concept of continual progress from lower stages of civilization. The need for miracles to justify history and the other sciences dealing with human activities was lessened by the growing prevalence of the Deists' doctrine of the inherent and reasonable "decency" of man—a notion widely at variance with the older views of the "Fathers" and of Calvin, which maintained the hopeless depravity of mankind. Finally, the new discoveries and the secularization of natural and social philosophy produced a great extension of the interests of the historian beyond the field of politics and religion. In the writings of Voltaire, Raynal, Montesquieu and Heeren it became apparent that the impulse to a broader and sounder scope of history had begun to affect others than those who described the course of the explorations. Though this healthy tendency toward a wider field of historical investigation and narrative was to some extent checked by the renewed impulse to political history with 18th and 19th century nationalism, it had gained a foothold from which it was not entirely dislodged until it was overwhelmingly reinforced by the expansion of interest in social, economic and intellectual topics after the industrial revolution and its social and intellectual consequences in the 19th century.

The reaction of this philosophy of the new natural science and of the new social philosophy upon historiography appears in the writings of what is conventionally known as the "Rationalistic School" of historians or the historians of the "Aufklärung." While the writings of this school varied so greatly that it is customary to divide the writers into several groups, there was a fundamental unity of method and interest which makes it possible to summarize the general nature of the rationalistic histori-

ography of the 18th century. Much the most important innovation of this school was their uniform tendency to broaden the field of history, so that it would extend beyond the political intrigues of church or state and embrace the history of commerce, industry, and civilization in its widest aspects. The historians of the discoveries had shown a similar tendency, but their work had been confined to a discussion of the new world and they had not constituted a general European school of historians. With the rationalists, no matter what the period or country dealt with, there was an effort to adopt a broad cultural approach to history and to infuse embryonic sociological principles into historical analysis. Scarcely less important was their attempt to discredit superstition and the theological theories of historical causation, and to substitute for these purely natural causes. Their general theory of historical causation was crude and elementary, being the notorious so-called "catastrophic theory of history," whereby great movements or policies are accounted for as the result of a single personal act or of some isolated natural or political event. Being the first attempt in the history of historiography to provide a purely natural theory of causation, it was bound to be imperfect and unsatisfactory, but it was a great advance over the previous theory of supernatural or miraculous causation. It led, however, to an exaggerated emphasis upon the possibility of abrupt and artificial changes in social and political institutions. The "Romanticists" arose primarily as a reaction against this particular phase of the historical doctrines of the rationalists. Even the political history of the rationalists was given a new and more promising cast. It was no longer limited to the field of political apologetics, but became a truly critical political history as far as its attitude towards policies was concerned. It was not usually written by members of the governing classes nor under their patronage, but by representatives of the new bourgeoisie or third estate, who had little influence in the several European governments at that period. It became an agency of criticism and of agitation for reform but rarely for revolution. It must be remembered, however, that the critical powers of the rationalists were limited almost wholly to their attitude towards the general subject-matter of their history and were not exhibited to any comparable degree in their handling of the sources of information. As research scholars in the use and criticism of printed and manuscript documents they did not even approximate the level of the school of Mabillon.

The founder of the rationalistic school of historians and the master mind of the movement was François Arouet, more commonly known as Voltaire (1694-1778). The two dominating factors in Voltaire's political and historical philosophy were his great admiration for the English civilization of his time and his peerless powers as a critic. An apologist of an enlightened despotism allowing the free development of bourgeois culture and prosperity, he saw in the England of Walpole his political ideal, and his agitation for reform in France was limited wholly to a desire to create in France what he beheld in England. As a critic he has never been equalled in any age, primarily because of the fact that he was utterly

devoid of reverence or respect for any institution and was, thus, wholly free to give full expression to his reactions against every phase of obscurantism. His most finished historical work was the 'Siècle de Louis XIV,' which Fueter describes as "the first modern historical work." In it he broke wholly with the annalistic, and even with any strict chronological system, and for the first time divided an historical work in accordance with the topical system of arrangement. Again, it was the first time that the civilization of a great European state had been described in its totality. Voltaire's work was no mere skillful compilation; it was an attempt to exhibit the main currents of development in the whole life of a powerful state and a cultured society. As was the case with all the internationally-minded rationalists, there was little of that chauvinism in his work which disfigured the work of the political historians of the following century. Much less thorough, but equally significant was his 'Essai sur les Mœurs,' generally regarded as the first universal history in the true sense of the term. It was planned as a vast "Kulturgeschichte" of all ages and peoples. While Voltaire did not possess the knowledge or the leisure requisite for its execution and the work was ill-proportioned and marred by serious and almost fatal omissions, it was, nevertheless, one of the great landmarks in the development of historiography. It was the real foundation of the history of civilization in its modern sense; it was the first work in which credit was given to the non-Christian contributions, especially of the Arabs, to European civilization; it first put political history in its proper relations to economic and social history in the general development of humanity; and it silenced forever the theological and providential interpretations which had prevailed from Orosius to Bossuet. The most fundamental point in his philosophy of history, the notion of the "genius of a people," was later adopted by the Romanticists, with some grotesque exaggerations, in their conception of a "folk-soul."

Voltaire's point of approach found several distinguished representatives in England. There was one important difference, however; among the English writers there was no underlying impulse towards reform. In the case of the English historians of the period there was that same complacent self-satisfaction over the final perfection of English institutions that was evident in the legal works of Blackstone which aroused the fury of Bentham. The best example of this tendency was David Hume (1711-76). His 'History of England from the Invasion of Julius Caesar to the Revolution of 1688' gave Englishmen an interpretation of their national history conceived in the spirit of an urbane and dispassionate sceptic. Unlike the work of Voltaire, Hume's history was most superficial in its content and analysis. It was in no way a history of English civilization, and even the political history was superficial and inaccurate. The section on the mediæval period was practically worthless. Its only merit was in its treatment of the Stuart period, for which it provided the first truly historical and analytic interpretation of the great Civil War. His point of view was wholly insular and he was probably the least universal of the rationalist historians. A much abler historian was the

Scotchman, William Robertson (1721-93), the most avowed of Voltaire's English disciples. Of his three major works, 'The History of Scotland'; 'The History of America'; and 'The History of the Reign of the Emperor Charles V,' the latter, especially its introduction, was the most significant in the development of historical writing. Its lack of exhaustive scholarship is revealed by the fact that the author never learned to read German, but he made the best possible use of the sources he employed. He was the first to make clear the major outlines of the constitutional development in the Middle Ages and was one of the earliest to appreciate the cultural contributions of the mediæval Church. He was, however, the most decided of the exponents of the catastrophic theory of historical causation and to him is mainly due the prevalence of the exaggerated notion of the importance of the Crusades in every phase of the later culture and politics of Europe and also the further elaboration of Baronius' notion of the special significance of the year 1000. The member of the English school who has gained the most enduring and general fame was Edward Gibbon (1737-94). Generally estimated by critics as less able than Robertson, he was a classic example of the attainment of great success through ministering to the prevailing sentiments of his time, in the possession of an appealing subject, a fine classic style and the current complacency and mild rationalism. His 'Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire' dealt with a topic which was charged with an age-old thrill and a compelling interest. Less profound than Voltaire and much less significant for the history of historiography, Gibbon has won a more permanent reputation as a historian on account of causes readily understood. In addition to the more attractive and universally interesting subject with which he dealt, it was also a much more restricted subject, and, possessing abundant means and leisure, Gibbon was able to master most of the then available sources on his topic. The outstanding significance of his work consisted in the fact that it contained the first wholly secular and impartial study of the rise and expansion of Christianity. Possessing a cold and reserved personality he was not bitterly hostile, but divested Christianity of its traditional envelope of unique supernaturalism and treated it as he later dealt with the spread of Mohammedanism. The general outlines of his picture have never been superseded.

In Germany Voltaire found three followers in Schröder, Schmidt and Spittler. While August Ludwig Schröder produced a minor attempt at a universal history, his main work was done in the history of Slavonic Europe, where he found his ideal in the enlightened despotism of Catherine II. He had very limited powers of criticism, especially in regard to biblical matters; had no imagination and an unattractive style; but he was far the greatest philologist of the rationalist school. What Voltaire did for France, Hume for England, and Robertson for Scotland, was done for Germany by Michael Ignatz Schmidt (1736-94). His 'History of Germany' was one of the most finished products of rationalism in historical literature. His style was excellent; he was cautious and accurate in the use of his sources and was free from all chauvinism; he was the first to handle

the German Reformation in an impartial manner; and the scope of his work resembled Voltaire's in being a true history of civilization. The smaller German states and the Christian Church found their rationalist historian in Ludwig Timotheus Spittler (1752-1810). His work was best in dealing with very recent times. He idealized the Middle Ages, and to him is primarily due the origin of that rosy and romantic conception of the mediæval period as one in which the main events were tournaments and the chief figures were the trouvères, troubadours and minnesingers. He was the first writer to handle the whole history of the Church from the rationalist standpoint. His criticism was relatively mild, but he adopted the peculiar attitude of judging the Church from the viewpoint of an instrument for advancing the cause of rationalism.

The discussion of the contributions of the school of Voltaire would not be complete without a brief reference to the work of two writers not technically historians. Though the 'Scienza nuova' of Vico (1668-1744) undoubtedly contained the first definite anticipation of the modern dynamic theory of progress, he was too pious in his theology to be listed among the colleagues of Voltaire. Such was not the case with Turgot and Condorcet. In his discourse at the Sorbonne in 1750 on 'The Successive Advances of the Human Mind,' Turgot (1727-81) first set forth clearly the doctrine of continuity in history, the cumulative nature of progress and the causal sequence between the different periods of history—theories later so greatly emphasized by Mr. Freeman. An equally notable work was Condorcet's (1743-94) 'Historical Sketch of the Progress of the Human Mind,' which contained the best statement of the 18th century doctrine of progress and perfectibility. Less thorough-going echoes of this doctrine were heard from Kant in Germany and Godwin in England.

The rather advanced rationalism of Voltaire and his school could scarcely gain a general acceptance and a sustained success in the 18th century, when it was greatly beyond the general level of contemporary thought. It had also many crudities inseparable from the first courageous attempt to reconstruct history and bring it in harmony with the contemporary progress in scientific thought. It was natural, then, that there should be a reaction against many of its premises and methods, which was in part a recrudescence of obscurantism and in part an effort to correct some of the errors of the school of Voltaire. The stages in this reaction were gradual and clearly marked. It passed through the more moderate and conservative rationalism of Montesquieu to the almost irrational sentimentalism of Rousseau, and ended in the mystic and idealistic vagaries of romanticism. The school of Voltaire did not come to its own until it was revived with greater profundity by Buckle, Lecky, Morley, Stephen and White, as a result of the reaction of 19th century science upon historiography.

While Montesquieu's works as examples of historical criticism and accuracy are almost worthless, his broader attitude toward general methodology was of the utmost significance. He was not at all violent or revolutionary in his political theory, and his literary affinities were with humanism rather than rationalism.

He did, however, present certain phases of thought which were a marked improvement over Voltaire. Accepting Voltaire's unanalyzed doctrine of the "spirit of a people," he tried to show how this was produced by the operation of natural forces, particularly of climate, and first brought out clearly the fundamental proposition that the excellence of social institutions must be judged, not by an arbitrary and absolute standard, but by their relative adaptability to the spirit of the people for whom they serve or are intended to serve. Again, where Voltaire and his followers had dropped only casual reflections, Montesquieu offered a synthesis of the various factors of historical development, which, though crude, marked a considerable methodological advance. Finally, while the school of Voltaire had introduced the treatment of commercial factors in connection with political development, Montesquieu and his followers laid much more stress upon the great influence of commercial activities in the life of the state. The school of Montesquieu most faithfully represented the reaction of the commercial revolution on European historiography.

Being primarily a political philosopher rather than a historian, Montesquieu's disciples were more numerous among the political theorists than among the avowed historians. J. L. Delolme's 'Constitution of England'; Adam Ferguson's 'History of Civil Society,' and Joseph Priestly's 'First Principles of Government' were works that clearly exhibited the principles of Montesquieu in the field of political philosophy. But if Montesquieu had few disciples among historians, he had at least one of the highest order in Arnold Hermann Ludwig Heeren (1760-1842), one of that brilliant group of Göttingen professors of the period. His great work was entitled 'Thoughts Concerning the Politics, Intercourse and Commerce of the Leading Nations of Antiquity.' Its principles were those of Montesquieu improved by the more scientific analysis of economic life in the works of Adam Smith. With great skill he attempted to reconstruct the commercial life of antiquity and to indicate its hitherto unsuspected influence upon the course of the history of the various nations. Heeren was one of the best writers among historians. Abandoning all attempts at rhetorical flourish, he produced a most thoughtful work written with great clarity and coherence. Edouard Meyer, the greatest of authorities on the history of the ancient nations, has called Heeren the leader of all who have subsequently attempted to deal with this field.

Much less sound was the remaining group of the rationalist school, that which followed the lead of Rousseau and formed the logical transition from rationalism to romanticism. There were a number of important differences between Rousseau and Voltaire in their attitude toward historical and social problems. In the first place, Voltaire was purely intellectual and critical and little moved by sentiment; Rousseau was almost pathologically emotional, sympathetic and sentimental. In the second place, Voltaire was realistic and practical; Rousseau was idealistic and utopian. Finally, Voltaire wrote from the standpoint of the bourgeoisie, praised enlightened despotism, and had little faith in the political ability of the illiterate masses; Rousseau wrote as an ardent exponent

of the release of the masses from despotic political power. Until the period of the French Revolution, Rousseau's views could gain little currency in France for the intellectual circles were controlled by aristocrats, but in Germany he found several enthusiastic disciples.

The most attractive of Rousseau's German disciples in the field of history was the poet-dramatist-historian Friedrich Schiller (1759-1805), whose chief works were the 'History of the Rebellion of the Netherlands against the Spanish Rule' and 'The History of the Thirty Years War.' His works presented a combination of the sentiment and pathos of Rousseau with the native powers of a great dramatist and poet. In his history of the Dutch revolt he found the basis of an epic of deliverance from oppression, while in the description of the Thirty Years' War he saw in Gustavus Adolphus and Wallenstein the central figures for a great historical drama. It scarcely needs to be pointed out that in his grand epic and dramatic themes there was no place for the commonplace description of the elements of culture and civilization. He had great power of clear preliminary analysis of political movements, but once his narrative got under way the poet and dramatist gained complete control over the historian, and his work, like that of Carlyle, was a contribution to great literature rather than to historiography. A much more influential historian among contemporaries, but incomparably inferior in every sense to Schiller, was Johannes Müller (1752-1809). His most famous work was the 'History of the Swiss Confederation.' Though possessing a memory rivalling Macaulay's and a zeal for the study of sources comparable to that of Coulanges, he lacked wholly Macaulay's power of analysis, organization and narrative, and had none of the critical power of Coulanges. Though he read all the available sources, he not only lacked in organizing ability, but was also so devoid of critical powers as to be unable to detect and exclude contradictions in his own narrative. To Rousseau's sentimental devotion to liberty he added a pedantic imitation of classical rhetoric. His Swiss history became an epic of freedom combining the methods of Rousseau and Livy. His 24 books of general history were significant only in that they contributed to the exaggeration of that radically erroneous conception of the general "Gemüthlichkeit" of the Middle Ages, which had been given a powerful initial impulse in the work of Spittler. Rather a representative of several of the phases of the rationalistic historiography than a complete disciple of Rousseau was Johann Gottfried Herder (1744-1803). His notable work—'Reflections on the Philosophy of the History of Humanity'—was a composite of many current doctrines. It combined Rousseau's exaggerated enthusiasm for the state of nature and freedom from authority, Voltaire's conception of the reality and permanence of national character, Montesquieu's doctrine of the relation between national character and physical environment, and the theological conception, later expanded by Hegel, of the gradual development of humanity toward a state of freedom. His zeal for the state of nature and the natural man led him to restrict his discussion chiefly to primitive peoples. His particular em-

phasis upon the fixity of national character and the organic unity of national culture put him in direct line with the romanticists. Friedrich Christoph Schlosser (1776-1861) took over Rousseau's conceptions through the intermediary of Kant's "categorical imperative." In his 'History of the Iconoclastic Emperors' and his unfinished 'History of the World,' he anticipated the attitude of Lord Acton and passed judgment on historical events and figures according to the principles of the Kantian precepts of individual morality. His work had a sombre cast, due to his inordinate passion for Dante's 'Divine Comedy,' and his works were full of harsh and hasty criticisms of a purely subjective nature. He was not a critical scholar and he ignored social and economic history. His chief significance lies in the fact that he was one of the first notable historians to lay great emphasis upon the political importance of a national literature.

3. Romanticism and Historiography.—Even before Louis XVI had issued the royal edict directing an election of delegates to an "Estates-General," the reaction against the frank and direct rationalism of Voltaire had definitely commenced in the works of the above-mentioned disciples of Rousseau. To the conservative element it seemed that the events of the French Revolution had finally demonstrated the futility of the rationalistic doctrines of catastrophic causation and the possibility of altering social institutions through the application of a few "self-evident dictates of pure reason." Unfortunately, this laudable attempt to correct the artificiality of the dogmas of Voltaire led to a reaction in the opposite direction which was even less valid and progressive than the theories of the rationalists. Romanticism in historiography meant a decided retrogression in the direction of obscurantism, and was an integral part of that reaction in social science which is chiefly identified with the names of Burke, De Bonald, De Maistre and Von Haller. The basic historical premise of the historiography of romanticism was the doctrine of the gradual and unconscious nature of cultural evolution. It proclaimed the unique organic unity and development of all forms of national culture. There was a decided mystic strain in their thinking which maintained that the unconscious creative forces moved and operated in a mysterious manner which defied rationalistic analysis. It was held that all were subject to the operation of these mysterious forces of psychic power, which were later termed by Ranke, the "Zeitgeist." Great emphasis was laid upon tradition and the alleged "ideas" which went to make up this spirit of the age and of the nation. These conceptions naturally led to a dogma of political fatalism which represented the individual or the nation as powerless before the mass of creative spiritual forces. Revolution was represented as particularly wicked, futile and worthy of special condemnation. There grew up that philosophy of political "quietism" which fitted in excellently with the current *laissez-faire* doctrines of the economists and political theorists. Out of this tendency there developed that notorious and specious myth representing the Anglo-Saxon peoples as the perfect examples of political quietism, and, hence, of inherent political capacity, while an equally erroneous doctrine

pictured the French as the typical example of a revolutionary and unstable nation utterly devoid of all political capacity. This fundamental error did more than anything else to mar the accuracy of 19th century political history and philosophy and has not even yet been fully eradicated. Again, the idea of the pure, indigenous and spontaneous nature of national culture led to a narrowing of that cosmopolitan outlook of the rationalists and the centering of attention on purely national history. Further, for each nation the period of particular fertility for historical research was held to be the Middle Ages. This tendency was due in part to the strange misconception that this was the period of the fixing of the several national cultures and in part to the psychic affinity of the romanticists with the mediæval mental reaction to the problems of existence and causation. Language was believed to be the vital mark or criterion of nationality. This doctrine took its deepest root in Germany where language was almost the only bond of nationality, and it led to the great researches in philology associated with the names of Humboldt, Wolf, the brothers Grimm and Lachmann. On account of the fact that the romanticists maintained the hopelessness of any detailed analysis of historical causation, their philosophy of history ran in a "vicious circle." Without giving any scientific explanation of the development of the spirit of a nation, they attributed the peculiarities of national institutions, laws, literature and government to the genius of the nation, and then represented national character as the product of the art, literature, laws and institutions of a people. But in spite of the semi-obscurantic tendencies and the philosophical crudities of the romanticists, they must be given credit for having done much to correct the vicious catastrophic theory of the rationalists, and for having emphasized the element of unconscious growth in historical development and the vital truth of the organic unity of a cultural complex. It was left for Lamprecht, nearly a century later, to take over what was really valuable in the romantic doctrines and work them over into his famous theory of historical development as a process of transformations and mutations within the collective psychology of both the nation and humanity.

The expressions of romanticism in historiography were many and varied. Its doctrines were employed in the field of the investigation of legal origins by Karl Friedrich Eichhorn (1781-1854), whose "Political and Legal History of Germany" was devoted primarily to the study of early German law; and, above all, by Friedrich Karl von Savigny (1779-1861) in his "History of Roman Law in the Middle Ages," which was the most able and dogmatic defense of the conception of law as a product of the national "genius" of a people. In the field of the history and analysis of religion and literature it received its most notable expression in François René Auguste de Chateaubriand's (1768-1848) "Genius of Christianity"; in Madame de Staël's (1766-1817) "Literature in Its Relation to Social Institutions"; in Abel François Villemain's (1790-1870) "Sketch of the Eighteenth Century," and in the "History of German Poetry" by Georg Gottfried Gervinus (1805-71). Romanticism entered the

philosophy of history in the works of Friedrich Schlegel (1772-1829), F. W. J. Schelling (1775-1854) and Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831). Schlegel viewed the historical process as the gradual restoration in man of the lost image of God through the operation of a divinely revealed religion. Schelling interpreted historical development as the gradual revelation of God through the operation of the unconscious forces of creative genius. Hegel's "Philosophy of History" was founded upon his dialectic system of antithesis followed by synthesis, and upon his spiritualistic interpretation of history as "the necessary progress in the consciousness of liberty." Working from these premises he adapted the facts of history in such a way as to portray the successive migrations of the "Weltgeist" from the Orient to Lutheran Germany, bringing with it a continually expanding consciousness and realization of liberty. Hegel's rather grotesque system was purged of its most apparent crudities and applied with much greater learning and accuracy by Ferdinand Christian Baur (1792-1860) to the history of Christianity, and by Edouard Zeller (1814-1908) to the reconstruction of early Greek philosophy. The narrative school of romanticist historians was not only dominated by the general theories enumerated above, but by the literary canons of the historical novels of Walter Scott with their great emphasis upon the element of "local color." This tendency was really anti-historical, in that it aimed primarily to destroy all sense of historical perspective and to portray episodes or periods in the past in such a manner as to make them have the vividness and intimacy of contemporary events. It was a contribution to literature rather than to scientific history. Its only real impulse to improved historical writing lay in the fact that its literary attractiveness awakened an interest in history on a wider scale than ever before, and brought into the field many eminent scholars whose individual contributions to historical knowledge were greater than those of all of the narrative school of romanticists combined. Of this variety of narrative romanticist historical writing the most important products were the "History of the Conquest of England by the Normans" and the "Narratives of the Merovingian Period" by Augustin Thierry (1795-1856); the "History of the Dukes of Burgundy" by Baron de Barante (1782-1866), and the "History of the Italian States" by Heinrich Leo (1799-1878). A still further intensification of the subjective element in the narrative school was reached in the works of Michelet, Carlyle and Froude, where an attempt was made not only to bring the reader in immediate touch with the setting of the events narrated, but also with the personal impressions and attitudes of the author. The "History of France" of Jules Michelet (1798-1874) was the greatest product of French historical literature. The author was dominated by a passionate attachment to his country, possessed a marvelous creative imagination and a style notable for its word painting and its power of symbolical presentation, and stood forth as the great historical apologist for French democracy. The best portions are those dealing with the picturesque figures of the Middle Ages and the scenes of the French Revolution. The least attractive

personality of the group and the least worthy as a historian was Thomas Carlyle (1795-1881). In radical contrast to Michelet he was possessed of a sour contempt for the masses and an equally exaggerated interest in the picturesque figures of history. To him history was but the collective biography of the conspicuous figures through the ages, and he was responsible more than any other historian for the conventional disdain of the modern historian for those commonplace things of daily life which have had incomparably greater influence upon social development than the picturesque personalities. Carlyle indulged his prejudices in his 'Letters and Speeches of Cromwell,' his 'History of Frederick the Great' and his 'French Revolution.' While possessing only moderate value as sources of information, on account of the writer's uncontrollable prejudices and his utter lack of critical method, they earned him the undisputed position as "the greatest of English portrait painters." While his name has been adopted to designate chronic inaccuracy in historical investigation, Carlyle's disciple, James Anthony Froude (1818-94), was a much abler historian than his master. His faults were those of one constitutionally rather than carelessly or intentionally inaccurate, as he had a keen appreciation of the value of critical methods and his work was the first extended English history written on the basis of unpublished documents. His 'History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Defeat of the Spanish Armada' was an epic of English deliverance from the "slavery of Rome," and his Carlylian attraction for great personalities found ample scope for expression in his portraits of Henry VIII and Burleigh. As a writer he was approached among English historians only by Macaulay. "No other English historian," says Gooch, "has possessed a style so easy, so flowing, so transparent." America found its sole distinguished representative of the school of Carlyle and Froude in John Lothrop Motley (1814-77), who devoted his life to a narration of the struggle of the Netherlands against Spain. Surpassing even Freeman in his passion for liberty, he found a most congenial subject in tracing the successful revolution of the Dutch and the establishment of their republic. For word painting and vivid description of dramatic scenes only Carlyle has equalled him among historians writing in the English tongue. While the conceptions of romanticism gained some dominion over the minds of greater scholars, such as Ranke, they served rather to stimulate the author's interest in history than to vitiate his scholarship. With its emphasis on the doctrine of the "genius of a nation" and its deep emotional basis, romanticism was a powerful influence in stimulating the nationalistic historiography which dominated the historical writing of the 19th century.

4. **Nationality and Historiography.** The commercial revolution not only was the main factor in arousing historical interest in non-European peoples and a powerful impulse in the development of the new natural science and its accompanying sceptical philosophy, but was also the chief force in bringing to completion the process of shaping the modern national states out of the great feudal monarchies of the later Middle Ages. By its contributions to

the increase of the capital and resources at the disposal of the monarch, and its creation of a loyal middle class, it enabled the kings to provide a hired officialdom and military force, by means of which they could crush the opposition of the feudal nobility and bring to perfection the modern national state. The psychological impulses arising from the welling-up of national pride in the newly fashioned states led to the production of narratives glorifying the national past and to feverish activity in collecting the sources of information which preserved the priceless records of the achievements of the nation from the most remote period. While this movement, in its earliest phases, goes back to the 16th century it took on its modern form after the French Revolution, the Napoleonic Wars and the regeneration of Prussia had contributed so greatly to the creation of an ardent national self-consciousness in most of the European states. Coming at this time, it was reinforced by the then popular tenets of romanticism emphasizing the importance of national character and the imperishable "genius of a people." The nationalistic impulse was refreshed from another source in the middle of the 19th century by the vicious influence of the notorious 'Essai sur l'inégalité des races humaines,' published by Count Joseph Arthur of Gobineau (1816-1882) in 1854. It proclaimed the determining influence of racial differences on the course of historical development, asserted the inherent superiority of the "Aryan" race, and held that racial degeneration was the inevitable result of its mixture with inferior races. His now utterly discredited doctrines gained great vogue among French, English, and especially among nationalistic German, historians and publicists, culminating in the Teutonic rhapsody of Charles Kingsley and Houston Stuart Chamberlain, the Gallic ecstasy of Maurice Barrès and the Saxon paens of Kipling and Homer Lea. Not only was this doctrine effective in developing a still greater degree of chauvinism upon the part of the governing "races," but it also led to the persecution of minority "races" and the consequent stimulation of their nationalistic sentiments.

Perhaps the earliest state to begin a national history was Germany in the days of humanism and the old empire. The cultured Emperor Maximilian I (1493-1519) followed the example of Charlemagne in gathering to his court at Vienna some of the leading historical scholars of German humanism. Conrad Celtis revived an interest in the 'Germania' of Tacitus. Johannes Spiesheimer (1473-1529), better known as Cuspinian, made a critical study of the historical works of Jordanes and Otto of Freising. Irenicus, Peutinger and Beatus Rhenanus (1486-1547) exhibited the spirit of Blondus in their researches into German antiquities. Their activity was soon smothered, however, in the controversies of the Reformation, and interest in secular and national history waned. A century later Melchior Goldast (1578-1635) produced his famous collection of documents dealing with early and mediæval German history and public law, known as the 'Monarchia romani imperii,' which was the standard German collection until the 'Monumenta' had covered the same period and material in a more thorough fashion. The distin-

guished philosopher G. W. Leibnitz (1646-1716) was ambitious to provide a collection of the sources of German history which would rival those on French history which had been gathered by Duchesne. He was not, however, able to obtain the necessary imperial support and the project had to be abandoned. He merely produced a collection on the history of the Guelfs as a by-product of his history of the dynasty of Brunswick. The great modern collection of the sources of German history, the justly famous 'Monumenta Germaniae Historica,' was a product of the spirit of the War of Liberation and was begun by that greatest of all the German statesmen of his time, Baron vom Stein. Discouraged by the reactionary tendencies of the period following the Congress of Vienna, Stein devoted his energies to the stimulation of popular interest in German history. Failing to obtain government support for a collection of the sources of German history, he raised the funds from the resources of himself and his friends, and with rare good fortune secured an editor of great scholarship and energy in the Hanoverian archivist, G. H. Pertz. Pertz carried the burden of the editorship for a half century, aided by the best of German scholars, most prominent of his colleagues being the constitutional historian, Georg Waitz. This magnificent and colossal compilation includes all the important sources of information regarding German history from the time of the Roman writers on the invasions, and is still in process of execution. It was, perhaps, one of the greatest landmarks in the development of scientific historical writing, as it alone made possible the productivity and accuracy of the succeeding generations of historians.

National history in Germany was not limited to the collection of sources, but received expression in glowing narratives which usually found their theme in the glories of the German imperial past of the mediaeval period or in laudatory accounts of the Hohenzollern achievements, which served as the basis of enthusiastic proposals for a Prussian revival of the glories of the empire. Schmidt had written a history of Germany from the rationalist standpoint, but his cosmopolitan outlook made his work quite unsatisfactory to the patriots. Wilken initiated the nationalistic narrative by an account of German prowess in the period of the Crusades. Lüden, under the spell of Johannes Müller's views of the mediaeval period, produced a 'History of the German People,' in which he aimed to arouse national enthusiasm for the magnificence of mediaeval Germany. Voigt contributed an epic dealing with the conversion and conquest of Prussia by the Teutonic knights. Raumer pictured the achievements of the Hohenstaufens, and Stenzel portrayed the deeds of the Franconian emperors with critical skill as well as patriotic edification. Giesebricht analyzed the formation of the mediaeval empire with a display of scholarship not less remarkable than his Teutonic fervor. Though his history of the Reformation was a powerful influence in making Luther the great German national hero, it must be admitted that Ranke and his immediate disciples shared something of the universal outlook of the rationalists, but with the rise of the 'Prussian School' nationalistic history became even more chauvinistic and dynastic. Häusser contributed

a voluminous epic on the War of the Liberation in his 'History of Germany, 1786-1815.' Duncker, the historian of antiquity, from his work in editing the state papers of the great Hohenzollerns developed a fervid admiration for the dynasty which convinced him of its fitness to revive the imperial glories of old Germany. The first massive panegyric of Prussianism was the work of Johann Gustav Droysen (1808-84), who deserted his early liberalism to become an almost sycophantic eulogist of the Hohenzollerns. His monumental 'History of Prussian Policy' was marred not only by its grave prejudices in favor of the "mission" of the dynasty he admired, but also by the fact that it was almost wholly limited to the superficial field of Prussian foreign politics with little attention even to domestic policy, to say nothing of its total omission of the deeper social conditions and economic forces. The story was picked up where Droysen had left it by Heinrich von Treitschke (1834-96). His 'History of Germany in the Nineteenth Century' ranks with the histories of Michelet and Macaulay as one of the literary masterpieces of modern historiography. While it was charged with all of the vivid enthusiasm for Prussian leadership which marred the work of Droysen, Treitschke's work at least had the merit of devoting adequate attention to the fundamental cultural forces in national development. Heinrich von Sybel (1817-95), the third of the three leaders of the Prussian school, began his work as a disciple of Ranke by a brilliant work on the First Crusade and by a profound study of the origins of the German kingship, but the stirring political situation in the middle of the century led him away from the poise of his master and he became a thorough advocate of German unity through Prussian military leadership. His 'History of the French Revolution' was a massive polemic against the whole movement, and its central theme was the old romanticist dogma of the political incapacity of the French. From this spectacle of alleged political inertitude Sybel turned to an account of the events which demonstrated the supreme capacity of his nation in political affairs—the foundation of the German Empire by Bismarck. His voluminous work on 'The Foundation of the German Empire by William I' showed wonderful power in the clear presentation of a mass of political and diplomatic detail, but was fatally disfigured by downright dishonesty in its presentation of Bismarck's foreign policy, from which all the criminal duplicity was carefully excluded. By the time Sybel had finished his work, history in Germany had become too weak a vehicle to serve as a leading instrument for advancing national aspirations. Its place was taken by the literary products of Peters, Tannenberg and the Pan-German expansionists; of Bernhardi and the ultra-militarists; and of Chamberlain and the blatant Teutonists. The complete complicity of the Prussian historians in the production of this state of national exaltation has been clearly revealed by Guiland.

Nearly a century after the beginnings of German national historiography at the court of Maximilian the French began to turn their attention to the analysis and collection of the sources of their national history. This movement may conveniently be dated from the publication of the 'Franco-Gallia' of François Hot-

man in 1574. Other early examples of this tendency were the 'Antiquités gauloises et françoises' of Claude Fauchet (1579); the 'Annales Francorum' of Pierre Pithou (1588); the 'Recherches de la France' of Etienne Pasquier (1611), and the material on the Crusades in the 'Gesta Dei per Francos' of Jacques Bongars (1611-17). The true beginning of the critical collection of sources was marked by the work of André Duchesne (1584-1640) in compiling the 'Historiae Normannorum scriptores antiqui' (1619) and the 'Historiae Francorum scriptores coetanei' (1636f.); the 'genealogies' and the 'Gallia christiana' of the brothers Sainte-Marthe (1572-1650, 1655); the critical editions of Villehardouin and Joinville by Charles du Fresne du Cange (1610-88); and the 'Capitularia regum Francorum' of Etienne Baluze (1630-1718). During the last half of the 17th century and the first half of the 18th this work of collecting sources was carried on almost entirely by the scholarly Benedictine monks of the Congregation of Saint Maur at Saint-Germain-des-Prés in Paris, which was founded between 1618 and 1630 by Doms Martin Tesnière and Grégoire Tarisse, and whose leader in historical scholarship was the great Jean Mabillon (1632-1707). Only a few of their more notable collections can be mentioned here. Dom Thierry Ruinart (1657-1709) prepared critical editions of Gregory of Tours and Fredegarius; Dom Edmond Martène (1654-1739) the 'Thesaurus novus anecdotorum veterum scriptorum' and the 'Veterum scriptorum et monumentorum amplissima collectio'; Dom Bernard Montfaucon (1655-1741) 'Les Monuments de la monarchie françoise'; Dom Martin Bouquet (1685-1754) the famous 'Rerum Gallicarum et Francicarum scriptores,' which is still being continued by modern scholars under the title of the 'Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France'; and Dom Antoine Rivet de la Grange (1683-1749), aided by Duclou, Poncet and Colomb, began that unique 'Histoire littéraire de la France' which was completed by the French Institute at the very close of the last century. The Maurists also turned their attention to the history of the French provinces and gathered many valuable collections, the most famous of which was the 'Histoire générale de Languedoc' of Doms Vaissette and Vic (1730-49), recently revised by Molinier. In the latter part of the 18th century the laymen again came to the front, the most notable center of their activity being the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-lettres, which had been founded by Colbert in 1663. The most valuable product of their labors was the great collection of 'Ordonnances des rois de France' by J. de Laurière, Denis Secousse and L. G. de Brequigny (1714-1794). They also continued the 'Histoire littéraire' and the 'Gallia Christiana.' A further stimulus came when P. C. F. Daunou was appointed national archivist by Napoleon. He brought many foreign archives to Paris and also continued the work on the 'Histoire littéraire' and the other great Benedictine collections. The first monumental collection of sources produced in the 19th century was the voluminous 'Collection de mémoires relatifs à l'histoire de France' by Petitot and Monmerqué in one hundred and thirty volumes (1819-29). What Germany owes

to Stein for the gathering of the sources of German national history, France owes to Guizot, and more, for the latter not only organized the movement for the scientific work in collecting and editing the sources, but also was a historical scholar of the first order who contributed most valuable works from his own pen. Before he left historical writing for the field of political activity he had published a collection of thirty volumes bearing the same title as that of Petitot. In 1834 he organized the Société de l'histoire de France, which was first presided over by Barante and has since included in its membership the most famous historians of France. The 'Ouvrages publiés' of this society have amounted to over three hundred and fifty well edited volumes of source material. Even more important was Guizot's initiative in inducing Louis Philippe to appoint a sub-committee of the ministry of public education which was to devote itself to publishing the hitherto unpublished source material of French history. In the next year their work began to appear in the monumental series of the 'Collection de documents inédits sur l'histoire de France,' of which about three hundred and thirty volumes have thus far been published. The early editorial associates of Guizot in this enterprise were Mignet, Thierry, Guérard and Raynouard. With the foundation of the Société de l'Ecole des Chartes in 1829 the provision of competent editors was henceforth assured through the establishment of the world's greatest historical institute for the training of students in the use of documents — L'Ecole des Chartes. The 'Documents inédits' are the official French counterpart of the German 'Monumenta' and are even more valuable in that they are confined entirely to the presentation of material never before published. The French have also advanced a step beyond any other nation in providing great collections of sources for a study of their history in modern times. This has been due primarily to the fact that no other European state has possessed a national event or movement in modern times at all comparable in picturesque or romantic interest to the French Revolution. Most of the great French collections of sources of modern history relate to some phase of the Revolution. In 1903 the socialist historian and statesman, Jaurès, succeeded in inducing the government to establish a committee of the ministry of public instruction to supervise the publication of the unpublished documents dealing with the economic history of the French Revolution. This work has been carried on by the leading French historians, and the 'Collection de documents inédits sur l'histoire économique de la Révolution Française' has been appearing in successive volumes since 1905. The municipal government of Paris has been publishing the 'Collection de documents relatifs à l'histoire de Paris pendant la Révolution Française' since 1888. In addition to these public collections, many collections of sources dealing with special phases of the Revolution have been made by enterprising scholars, among whom Aulard and his pupils have been most active.

The French also vied with the Germans in the production of nationalistic historical narrative. The publication of Chateaubriand's 'Genius of Christianity' in 1802 gave a lustre

and romantic touch to the French past in the middle ages comparable to the effect produced in Germany by Spittler and Johannes Müller. Fauriel anticipated Coulanges and Julian in his history of Gaul by contending for the superiority of Celtic to Frankish culture in the formation of mediæval civilization. Michaud described the glories of the French in the period of the Crusades. Raynouard drew a vivid picture of the *troubadours* and proclaimed the supremacy of French among the Romance languages. Hanotaux, Fagniez and Chéruel analyzed with both critical erudition and patriotic pride the centralization of the French monarchy by the great statesmen of the 17th century. Lamartine, in a work which rivalled Carlyle in the field of literature and was equally unscientific as history, set forth with fervid admiration the glories of the French Revolution, and especially the exploits of the Girondists. Mignet, the most scholarly French historian in the first half of the 19th century, made an attack on the Bourbon Restoration by representing the French Revolution as the necessary and inevitable outgrowth of the tendencies of the age and as the dawn of a new and better era in the history of the world. Thiers, while critical of the empire, praised the first consul as the saviour of France and of European civilization. Napoleon was defended in his imperial splendor by Masson, Vandal and Lévy; Vandal representing him as peace-loving and goaded to war by English jealousy, and Lévy presenting a superhuman and faultless personality. Thureau-Dangin, while deplored its popular origin, appeared as the historical apologist of the "July Monarchy." La Gorce dealt with the "Second Empire" as an apologist of monarchy and clericalism, if not of the personality of Napoleon III. Olivier dwelt with pride upon the liberal tendencies of the last decade of the Empire, and Hanotaux, in one of the finest products of national historiography in France, has described and defended the establishment of the "Third Republic." Nor was France lacking in general histories written from the national point of view. Early in the 19th century Sismondi produced the first detailed and complete history of France. It was written from the standpoint of an ardent liberal who castigated kings and bishops and lauded the liberal tendencies in the communes. But Sismondi was a Genevan and to some extent a representative of the mild rationalism of Rousseau, and his work was not calculated to arouse intense patriotic enthusiasm. Much different, except in its liberalism, was the brilliant work of Michelet, which was not only a great contribution to French literature but to the stimulation of patriotic pride, especially on the part of liberal Frenchmen. Henri Martin's history of France was less brilliantly written than Michelet's, but rested on sounder scholarship and for a half century has remained the popular national history of France on account of its logical arrangement, lucid presentation and its central theme of the progressive growth of French national unity. The great co-operative work edited by Lavisse belongs to the field of erudite and critical rather than nationalistic historiography. French nationalism was greatly stimulated by the sting of the defeat and injustices of 1870. While the scholarly French his-

torians, such as Gorce and Sorel, maintained an impartiality in treating of the war of 1870, which put to shame the fawning apology of Sybel, there was a great outburst of nationalistic ardor on the part of the "super-patriots" among their countrymen. These tendencies found expression, above all, in the fiery speeches, poetry and pamphlets of Paul Déroulède, the chief of the "Ravachards," and in the brilliant polemics and eulogies of his admirer, that ardent Gallican and head of the League of Patriots, Maurice Barrès, whose study of French history has convinced him that "the French make war as a religious duty. They were the first to formulate the idea of a Holy War. It is not in France that wars are entered upon for the sake of spoil, but as a champion in the cause of God, as a knight upholding justice."

England did not begin any systematic collection of the sources of its national history until the beginning of the 19th century. In the year 1800 the Record Commission was created, but no real historian was connected with its labors until Sir James Mackintosh was appointed in 1825. In 1830 Harris Nicolas called attention to the deplorable condition of the "sources" in England and his criticism led to the creation of a new and more active and critical committee of the Record Commission. A product of this improvement was the edition of the Parliamentary Writs by Palgrave. No systematic activity in the collection of sources began until after the middle of the century. At this time, William Stubbs, the greatest of English mediævalists before Maitland and the Anglicized Russian, Vinogradoff, vigorously criticized the work of the Record Commission. Shortly afterwards, in 1857, Lord Romilly, the Keeper of the Rolls, was able to secure an appropriation from the government to publish the sources of English mediæval history and the general oversight of the project was conferred upon Duffus Hardy, a careful, if not brilliant, scholar. The work of editing these sources has been carried on by a number of English mediævalists, among them Brewer, Gairdner, Canon Robertson, Giles and Dimock, but far the greatest figure was the English Waitz, Bishop William Stubbs (1825-1901). For more than a quarter of a century after 1863 he gave much of his time to this work. This collection, which was finished in 1896 in two hundred and forty-four volumes, is known as the "Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain and Ireland during the Middle Ages" ("Rerum Britannicarum mediæ aevi scriptores") or, more briefly, as the "Rolls Series" from the fact of its publication by the Master of the Rolls. It is the official British analogue of the "Monumenta" and the "Documents inédits." Less pretentious collections have been provided by the Camden Society and the Early English Texts Society. There should also be mentioned the great collection of the sources of English legal history provided by the Selden Society, and the publication of the manuscript records of important voyages and explorations by the Hakluyt Society.

The historiography of nationalism has not been less vigorous in England than in Germany or France. Its most conspicuous feature has been the expansion of the "Myth Teutonicus" regarding the political superiority of the Anglo-Saxon

peoples, which was so popular a tenet of romanticism and had been so fervidly expounded by Edmund Burke. It rested primarily upon the assumption that the Teutonic invaders of England had made a clean sweep of the Briton and Celtic inhabitants and had created a purely Germanic England in culture if not in race. The most vigorous and the earliest statement of this view appeared in Kemble's 'The Saxons in England,' which was published in 1849. It not only taught this notion to Englishmen, but was widely read in Germany and served to furnish the German nationalists with a further basis for their convictions regarding the Germanic "mission," which had been drawn from their own mediæval sources. Freeman carried the argument still further in his 'History of the Norman Conquest,' in which he not only accepted the Saxon theory, but, being an ardent lover of liberty like Michelet, espied the real foundations of political liberty in the Germanic folk-moot, and particularly in its English manifestation. This myth, dating back to Thoyras and Montesquieu, so thoroughly punctured by Coulanges, has been one of the most persistent and pernicious sources of error which have come down from a pre-anthropological stage in historical studies. Even the calm and cautious Bishop Stubbs and the charming John Richard Green were also seduced by this fiction of a Teutonic England, which was to be challenged by Seeböhm and modified by Maitland and Vinogradoff. The greatest popular emotional impulse toward this Teutonic interpretation came from the notorious work of the poet-historian, Charles Kingsley, on 'The Roman and the Teuton,' which was first published in 1864. Highly entertaining but almost wholly unscientific and non-historical, it did more to pervert the interpretation of early mediæval history than any other book of its time. He idealized the "young and virile" Teutonic "Forest Children" with the ardor of a Las Casas, and set them in marked and flattering contrast with the morally and physically decadent Romans of the "Dying Empire," and rejoiced in the destruction of the latter by the "Human Deluge" from the North. It is a sufficient commentary upon the accuracy of his work to note that the labors of scholarly mediævalists for the last generation have chiefly centered about the rejection of every one of his main theses. The book, however, gained a great popular vogue and no Englishman could read it without desiring to trace his ancestry back to Arminius and Alaric. Passing from the Middle Ages, where the national grandeur of Britain had been laid by the Teuton, the most intensely nationalistic of English historians, James Anthony Froude, described the glories of the English revolt from Rome. Carlyle lauded the virtues of Cromwell and his associates of the Commonwealth period. The Whig apologists, Mackintosh, Hallam, and above all, Macaulay, described the salvation of the world's liberties by the "Glorious Revolution" of 1688. Macaulay's 'History' is the English counterpart of Treitschke and Michelet, and marks the most brilliant of English contributions to historical literature, as well as a valuable, though prejudiced body of historical knowledge. Lecky's study of 18th century England could scarcely be

called nationalistic on account of its impartiality, but Napier praised English prowess in the Peninsular War in a work which was as frank an adulation of war as a process in human society as was Bernhardi's work a half century later. Finally, Seeley, an example of both nationalism and erudition, wrote with restrained pride of the development of the British Empire in his 'Expansion of England' and 'Growth of British Policy.' Not only was Seeley a nationalist, but along with Freeman he was chiefly responsible for turning English historiography into the narrow and unnatural channels of political history. The growth of English national enthusiasm, which accompanied the work of Cecil Rhodes and the Boer War, did not fail to produce its nationalistic literature, which was as far removed from the scholarly grasp of Seeley as was the attitude of Bernhardi from that of Sybel. Bernhardi found his English counterpart in Prof. J. A. Cramb, who detected in England's past wars the governing principle "of that higher power of heroism which transcends reason." Curiously enough, as it had fallen to a renegade Englishman, H. S. Chamberlain, to arrange the apotheosis of "Germania," so it required an American, Homer Lea, to link up the future salvation of the world with the necessity of the universal triumph of "Britannia," through the strengthening and preservation of "the scarlet circle of power that the Saxon has marked around the earth as has no other race before him."

Italy shares the double honor of having been the first nation to provide a complete collection of its sources of national history and of having produced the most indefatigable of all editors in Lodovico Antonio Muratori (1672-1750). From 1723 until his death in 1750 he brought together in the 25 folio volumes of the 'Rerum italicarum scriptores' nearly all of the extant sources of Italian history. So thorough was his work that it has only been deemed necessary in recent years to undertake a new edition of his collection, which has been in progress since 1900 under the supervision of Giosuè Carducci and Vittorio Fiorini. It is scarcely to be doubted that the new edition is quite as much a sublimation of patriotic impulses as an enterprise entered upon in the interests of historical scholarship.

While the national narrative history, like the collection of sources, dates back to a more remote period in Italy than in the other states of Europe, it began in its modern phase with Botta's 'History of Italy during the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars,' which breathed forth the ardent liberalism which found expression in the politics of the period in the activities of the Carbonari. Coletta condemned the corruption and incapacity of Bourbon absolutism in Naples. Troya and Tosti surveyed the history of mediæval Italy for evidence to support their plea for papal leadership in Italian unity, while D'Azeglio turned to contemporaneous Italy to prove papal incapacity and to call attention to the promise of leadership in the House of Savoy. More recently Luzzo, De Cesare and Chiala have dealt with the period of the "Risorgimento" and establishment of national unity, but the Italian enthusiasm over their attainment of national independence and unity has scarcely cooled sufficiently to find his-

tory an effective method of expression; up to the present time it has been recounted chiefly in the patriotic poetry of Giosuè Carducci and Gabriele D'Annunzio.

The first collection of Spanish sources was not the work of Spaniards, but of the itinerant English scholar, Robert Beal (d. 1601), who published his *'Rerum hispanicarum scriptores'* in 1579-81. Nearly two centuries later J. A. C. Bertodano produced his extensive collection of sources on diplomatic history (1740-52). The great national collection of sources, however, was not begun until the middle of the 19th century when Pidal, Salvá and others started the *'Colección de documentos inéditos para la historia de España'*, which was completed in 112 volumes (1842-95). In addition, the Royal Academy of History at Madrid has been publishing source material since 1851 in the collection entitled *'Memorial histórica español'*. Spain found her great national historian in Modesto Lafuente (1806-66). His monumental *'Historia general de España'*, which was intended to be a continuation of *Mariana*, appeared in 30 volumes from 1850-67, and was continued after his death by J. Valera.

The sources of Austrian history were not only collected in the German *'Monumenta'*, where the great scholar, Theodor Sickel, rendered valuable editorial assistance, but also in separate national collections, the *'Fontes rerum Austriacarum'*, published since 1849 by the Vienna Academy, and the new edition of Böhmer's *'Regesta imperii'*, edited by Ficker since 1877 at Innsbruck. The great national narrative history of Austria was Arneth's monumental work on the times of Maria Theresa, while Klopp has recalled the imperial heroes of the Thirty Years' War and conducted an attack on Frederick the Great.

In Bohemia, Czech nationalism did not initiate interest in history as in other European states, but rather history aroused nationalism in the first instance. To the vigorous patriotism of F. Palacky's *'History of Bohemia'*, more than to any other source, the modern Czech national spirit owes its origin. The sources of Bohemian history have been collected by the greatest of Bohemian historical scholars, Anton Gindley, and are entitled *'Monumenta Historiae Bohemica'* (1864-90). The Hungarian government has been publishing the *'Monumenta Hungaria historica'* at Budapest since 1857, and Hungary has found in Fessler and his continuators its national historians. Poland has published two large collections of sources, and Lelewel and Szajnocha have reminded the Poles of their ancient splendor and power. The obscurantism of Czardom has prevented the development of historical scholarship in Russia, a loss to Russia which can be appreciated by a survey of the great work of the exile, Vinogradoff. Karamsin's antiquated history presents an apology for the absolutism and Oriental culture of the early czars, while the more recent and scholarly work of Soloviev defends the introduction of Western culture by Peter the Great. Further, it should not be forgotten that both Belgium and Holland are represented by extensive collections of sources and able national historians. Belgian enthusiasm for the collection of sources of national history began with the attainment of independence in 1830.

The great national collection is the *'Collection de chroniques Belges inédites'*, published in 111 volumes at Brussels since 1836. The *'Société d'émulation de Bruges'*, published between 1839 and 1864 the 56 volumes of the *'Recueil de chroniques, chartes, et autres documents concernant l'histoire et les antiquités de la Flandre occidentale'*. In addition Wauters has edited the great collection of communal charters and Gachard has edited the foreign archives of the period since the 15th century. The great Catholic and Belgian counter-blast to Motley's work, as well as to that of Prinsterer, was contained in the work of Lettenhove on the 16th century. He condemned William the Silent and his Protestant supporters and defended the position of Spain and the Catholic party. His somewhat chauvinistic and obscurantist work has been superseded by the admirable critical works of Frédéricq and Pirenne. While Holland has not provided as complete a collection of national sources as Belgium, the Historical Society of Utrecht has been publishing important sources since 1863—the *'Werken uitgegeven door het Historisch Genootschap te Utrecht'*—and Prinsterer has edited the voluminous archives of the House of Orange. In 1902 a royal commission of the most eminent Dutch historians was appointed to arrange for the systematic publication of the manuscript sources of the history of Holland. The most enthusiastic Dutch nationalistic narrative history was that by Prinsterer in which Protestantism and the House of Orange received their vindication and eulogy. This has now been rendered obsolete by the scholarly monographs of Fruin, the greatest of Dutch historians, and by the accurate and well-balanced general history of Blok. The Scandinavian nations have not been unproductive in the field of national historiography. The sources have been collected in the following series: the *'Scriptores rerum Danicarum mediæ ævi'*, edited by Langebek and his successors; the *'Diplomatarium Norvegicum'*, edited by Lange; and the *'Scriptores rerum Suecicarum'*, edited by Geijer and his associates. The nationalistic historical narrative was introduced in Denmark by Worsaae; in Norway by Keyser and Munch; and in Sweden by Geijer, Carlson and Fryxell. These works have been succeeded by the more recent and scholarly national histories of Steenstrup on Denmark; Sars on Norway; and Hjärne on Sweden. If there were available space it would be easy to demonstrate the very great, if not determining, influence of the study of the glories of their national past upon the rise of the national aspirations of the Balkan peoples since 1820. The well-known influence of Alexandru Xénopol's *'Histoire des Roumains de la Dacie Trajane'* upon Roumanian nationalism is but a typical illustration of the fertility of such an investigation.

Surely, no account of the interrelation of nationality and historiography in modern times would be complete without some reference to the national historiography of Judaism and Zionism. The rise of Jewish nationalism in the last century was intimately related to the general development of nationality in Europe during that period. This stimulated Jewish national spirit, both by the direct influence of imitation and through the persecution of the

Jews, as a result of the growing chauvinism throughout continental Europe after 1870. The relation of this growth of Jewish national sentiment to the remarkable development of the interest of the Jews in their national history is readily apparent. Historical societies were formed in all the leading modern states—the "Société des études juives," founded in 1880; the Historical Commission of the "Union of German-Jewish Congregations," appointed in 1885; "The American Jewish Historical Society," created in 1892; and "The English Jewish Historical Society," founded in 1895. These societies have done valuable work in compiling sources of Jewish history and in arousing interest in its study. Especially to be noted is the "Regesten zur Geschichte der Juden im fränkischen und deutschen Reiche bis zum Jahre 1273," published by the German Jewish Historical Commission since 1887. Including an account of the Jewish persecutions in the mediæval period, it has tended to arouse their national resentment at past, as well as present, oppression. The Jews have also been stirred by the work of a great national historian, Heinrich Graetz (1817-91). Isaac M. Jost (1793-1860), in his "History of the Israelites," and his "History of Judaism," had surveyed the history of the Jews, but he was too liberal, rationalistic and impartial a writer to serve as a truly national historian. Widely different was the work of Graetz, sometimes called the Jewish Treitschke. Conservative and generally orthodox, and fired with a warm enthusiasm for the past and future of his people, Graetz traced in an eloquent manner the history of the Jews from their origins to 1848, laying special stress upon their literary and spiritual development, in other words, upon the elements which contributed the most to the development and persistence of their national culture. Graetz's work was especially in line with the development of "Zionism," for he insisted that the true Messiah was the national spirit of the Jewish people and he discouraged further delay through awaiting the coming of a personal Messiah. In addition to the general history of Graetz, there should be mentioned the many histories dealing in a comprehensive fashion with the history of the Jews in the different European states.

In connection with this brief summary of the reaction of nationalism upon historiography in Europe some passing reference should be made to the growth and accumulation of archival material and its accessibility to students. The development of the national states and their administrative bureaucracies led to a great amount of administrative "red tape" and to the growth of fixed diplomatic correspondence. From these sources a rich storehouse of historical material had accumulated in the national, ecclesiastical and private archives by 1800. Before they could be generally useful to historians, however, the sources in the archives had to be classified and centralized and made public to creditable historians. In the matter of centralization and classification of archival material France has taken the lead, due chiefly to the large number of highly-trained archivists provided by l'École des Chartes. At the present time only England is exceedingly backward among the European states in providing for a systematic arrangement and classification of its

archival material. In the same way that national pride and competition led to the compilation of the great source collections of national history, it forced the several European states at various dates during the 19th century to open the national archives to historical scholars. In addition, the liberal-minded Pope, Leo XIII, opened the Vatican archives in 1881 and secular scholars for the first time had the privilege of examining the treasures that Baronius had made use of. Even at the present time, however, complete freedom is not accorded anywhere in the use of archival material, scholars being excluded from the more recent documents. For instance, the Vatican archives are accessible only to 1815, those of France to 1830, and those of England to 1867. In America, scholars like Gaillard Hunt are laboring to put the archival material of the United States upon the same high plane that it has reached in most European countries.

The United States has never provided a great official collection of the sources of its national history comparable to those prepared by the European countries. This has been due in part to the particularism inherent in the American Federal system and in part to the fact that the American central government has been too much absorbed in the details of routine legislation to be able to concentrate its attention on the furthering of intellectual interests. The true American counterpart of the movement of collecting sources of national history, which was associated in Europe with the names of Pertz, Guizot, Nicolas, Hardy and Stubbs, is to be found in the rather pathetic attempt of Peter Force (1790-1868) to obtain adequate government support for his "American Archives," which were designed to constitute a complete collection of the sources of the history of the United States from the period of discovery to the formation of the constitution. Its psychological and historical affinity with the European movement is clearly indicated by Force's statement of his aims. "The undertaking in which we have embarked is, emphatically, a national one; national in its scope and object, its end and aim." After a painful process of protracted importuning, Force received a Federal appropriation which allowed him to begin publishing his "Archives" in 1837, but the government aid was soon withdrawn and the published material was but an insignificant fraction of what it had been planned to include. Owing to the fact that American historical scholarship was then a generation behind that of Europe, Force was primarily a hard-working antiquarian compiler rather than a scholarly editor like Pertz, Waitz, Mignet, Guérard, Hardy or Stubbs, and the national loss from the cessation of his work was infinitely less than would have been occasioned by a discontinuance of the "Rolls Series," the "Monuments" or the "Documents Inédits." The collections which have been made have been primarily the result of the enterprise of individuals, publishing companies and the historical societies of the several commonwealths. The process began with the publication of Jared Sparks' writings of Washington between 1834 and 1838. The most ambitious attempt to make a thorough collection was the work of Mr. Hubert Howe Bancroft in the last half of the 19th century, in his gathering of the

sources of the history of the Pacific States. Unfortunately, he did not follow the example of Stein and secure the aid of a Pertz, but trusted to his own untrained guidance the execution of the project, with the result that the work lacked in critical scholarship and careful editing. An incomparably more scholarly work was the co-operative history of the colonization of America, edited by Justin Winsor, but, though this contained much source material, it was primarily a narrative work giving a critical review of the sources rather than including them. Parallel with this movement went the publication of source material by the various commonwealths in the vast collections of colonial records and archives, but in the great majority of cases these collections were prepared by erudite antiquarians rather than by men trained as critical historical editors, and there was no uniformity in the methods employed. Some of these state collections have, however, been of a very high order, the most notable being, perhaps, the extensive series dealing with the exploration and settlement of the middle West by Reuben G. Thwaites of Wisconsin. Another mode of collecting sources was exhibited in the editions of the messages and papers of the presidents and the writings of the chief statesmen by numerous scholars, which have varied widely in quality, reaching the highest level in W. C. Ford's (*Writings of Washington*); Gaillard Hunt's (*Writings of James Madison*) and P. L. Ford's (*Writings of Jefferson*). The United States has not been lacking in editorial ability of the highest order, for in Worthington C. Ford, James Franklin Jameson, Paul Leicester Ford and Gaillard Hunt are to be found the equals of Pertz, Waitz, Guizot or Stubbs. The great defect has been the lack of concerted planning and continued and adequate government aid. Promising beginnings in the right direction are to be seen in W. C. Ford's edition of the (*Journals of the Continental Congress*) and the scholarly products of the Carnegie Institution under Dr. Jameson's direction. John Bassett Moore has labored with almost Benedictine patience and productivity in the preparation of his monumental series dealing with the documentary history of diplomacy. There also should be mentioned the monumental collection of sources dealing with the history of labor in America which has been prepared by Professor Commons and his associates. Miss Adelaide Hasse has begun an invaluable series of volumes describing and classifying the sources for American economic and social history which are available in the public documents of the various commonwealths. On the whole, however, the United States has been incomparably delinquent in the thorough and scholarly collection of the sources of its national history, and it cannot seek refuge behind any assertion that this has been due to a lack of rabid nationalistic emotions.

If this country has not kept abreast of European development in the editorial aspect of national historiography, it can lay claim to having produced historians enthused with as ardent a patriotism as fired a Treitschke, a Michelet or a Froude. Nationalism in American historiography has, naturally, centred mainly about the romantic period of colonization and the struggle for American independence, and American

historians have surrounded this period with the halo given to the early national history of Germany and France by Johannes Müller and Chateaubriand. The chief figure in the creation of this national epic of migration and deliverance was George Bancroft, whose early years fell in that period of national bumptiousness and florid democracy in the "thirties" and "forties." To Bancroft, the history of the formation of the American Republic was no modest secular achievement of ordinary mortals, but a veritable *Eneid* in which Augustus was replaced by Washington and which exhibited in its succession of scenes "the movement of the divine power which gives unity to the universe, and order and connection to events." His history of the United States through the period of the Federal Constitutional Convention represented the process of colonization as the flight of brave spirits from oppression, characterized the American Revolution as a crusade of wholly virtuous and disinterested patriots in behalf of the liberties of civilized humanity, described the American constitution as the creation of a group of unique mental giants, never before equalled and not to be matched at any later epoch, and regarded their work as even more notable than its makers. The pathetic inaccuracy of all of his major premises can only be appreciated by a careful perusal of the scholarly treatment of the same topics by Beer, Van Tyne, M. C. Tyler, Osgood, Alyard, Andrews, Fisher, Farrand and Beard, and the damage done to proper perspective in American history by his works has been almost incalculable and irreparable. The myth was perpetuated in Palfrey's long Puritan apology and was repeated in a less vigorous form in Mr. Lodge's discussion of the English colonies in America. From his pride in American exploits in behalf of liberty and democracy, Motley was encouraged to study the analogous movement among the Dutch, when they rebelled against Spanish tyranny and established a republic. Francis Parkman, turning from the Anglo-Saxon phobia of Bancroft, first gave full credit to the work of France in colonizing the New World. He found that the record of heroism had not been wholly monopolized by the English and German colonists. While Parkman had turned his attention to the French in the North and West, William H. Prescott found his theme in the conquest and colonization of Central and South America by the Spanish, and in a brilliant description of the splendor of the native American civilizations of Mexico and Peru. Mahan, enthused by the exploits of the small American navy in the wars of the Revolution and 1812, was encouraged to make a study of the influence of naval supremacy upon the history of the past. Few works have been more influential in stimulating the disastrous growth of modern armaments. The period of cementing the national union through the efforts of the Federalists was glorified in the works of Hildreth and John Church Hamilton, and the blessings of the "pure" democracy of the Jacksonian epoch were set forth in the essays and addresses of Bancroft, who believed that he detected the very "voice of God" in the acclaim of Jackson's followers. Roosevelt described the process of American expansion westward with the buoyant and ill-concealed pride of an admirer of the

West and an ardent patriot and national imperialist. Von Holst beheld in the struggle over slavery one more great episode in that eternal conflict between righteousness and iniquity. Professor Burgess saw in the success of the North in the Civil War, not only a justification of his own nationalistic political philosophy, but also a sure manifestation of Teutonic genius in the field of political unification and organization. On the whole, however, by the time that the achievements of the Civil War and Reconstruction periods had come to be subjects for historical analysis the objective scholarship of the critical and erudite school had begun to prevail and the "American epic" passed, to be preserved only in the school texts of succeeding generations. The task of rationalizing the "Bancroftian epic" and adapting it to the prevailing tendencies of the latter part of the 19th century fell to the philosopher-historian, John Fiske (1842-1901). By his amiable Spencerian rationalism and his eulogy of the rise of the middle class he best summed up the prevailing spirit of the educated Americans of his time, and by his lively and attractive style and his primary concern with the period of discovery, colonization and revolution he attracted a following which probably entitled him to the position of the popular national historian of the last generation. He was the prophet of the new era in the interpretation of Anglo-American relations which replaced the Puritan and American epic of Bancroft by an account of the rise and triumph of the middle class in both England and America—"an epic of the English-speaking Peoples." He was as fully convinced as Burgess of the supreme political capacity of the Teutonic branch of the "Aryans." He held that the first instance of self-government in recorded history was to be seen in the Teutonic village-community, which was an "inheritance from prehistoric Aryan antiquity," and he believed that "American history descends in unbroken continuity from the days when stout Arminius in the forests of northern Germany successfully defied the might of imperial Rome." Fiske, however, stressed the element of liberty as the surest criterion of political capacity rather than the aspect of order and authority which found favor with Burgess. England under Gladstone seemed far better adapted than Germany under Bismarck for furnishing an edifying example of the attainment of complete political liberty, and the then popular theory of a wholly Teutonic England was an ethnic argument in favor of such an undertaking. Therefore, instead of conducting the muse of liberty directly from the "German forest primeval" to the Federal Constitutional Convention of 1787, Fiske arranged a detour in her migration to the new world which would guide her to America by the way of the "Glorious Revolution of 1688," in which, as the work of the English "bourgeoisie," "freedom both political and religious was established on so firm a foundation as never again to be shaken, never again with impunity to be threatened, so long as the language of Locke and Milton and Sydney shall remain a living speech on the lips of men." Working hand in hand with George Otto Trevelyan, he tried to show how the American Revolution was but the perfect fulfilment of the spirit of 1688.

He pictured it as the work of Whigs on both sides of the Atlantic in the heroic effort to check and crush the autocratic tendencies of a Tory squiresarchy and the unconstitutional tyranny of a "German King," and to preserve for the world the liberties embodied in the Bill of Rights. He dwelt with pride upon the establishment of the American Federal Republic and regarded it as the great contribution of the Western Hemisphere to the solution of political problems, by reconciling the liberty of the New England town-meeting with the existence of large political aggregates. He contemplated with unmixed pleasure the progress of the middle class in its political and economic conquest of the American continent in the 19th century, and, just before his death at the opening of the 20th, he was deeply gratified to see his own country at last assume its part of the "white man's burden" by the retention of the Philippines. Not at all a militarist, he looked upon this as a most significant step in that process of bringing the world under the peaceful dominion of "the two great branches of the English race which have the mission of establishing throughout the larger part of the earth a higher civilization and a more permanent political order than any that has gone before."

Even the more progressive Latin American states have begun to produce extensive collections of the sources of their national history. The 'Documentos para la Historia Argentina,' which have been edited by L. M. Torres and the faculty of philosophy and letters of the National University of Buenos Aires since 1911, is a typical example of this process.

The net result of the growth of nationality and of nationalism upon historiography has been greatly varied and a mixed blessing. Its fortunate results have been, above all, the provision of great collections of source material which would otherwise never have been made available and the training of many excellent historians in the process of the compilation and editing of the sources. The deplorable effects have centered about the creation of a dangerous bias of patriotism, which not only prevented a calm, objective and accurate handling of historical facts, even by highly trained historians, but also contributed in no small degree to the great increase in chauvinism which led to the calamity of 1914. The responsibility of the nationalistic historians in this regard has been well stated by Prof. H. Morse Stephens, probably the most thorough student of this particular subject: "Woe unto us! professional historians, professional historical students, professional teachers of history, if we cannot see written in blood, in the dying civilization of Europe, the dreadful result of exaggerated nationalism as set forth in the patriotic histories of some of the most eloquent historians of the 19th century." It would be fortunate, indeed, if this were all, but for every patriot made by a Treitschke, a Michelet, a Froude or a Bancroft, hundreds have been enthused by the petty chauvinism of the third-rate textbook compilers who have imitated their bias without their literary virtues. The nature and effect of these textbooks upon the past generation has been indicated for this country by Mr. Charles Altschul and for France and Germany by Dr. J. F. Scott. England has not fallen behind any of these nations in this re-

spect. Some optimism for the future may, however, be discovered in the fact that there is an ever greater tendency for the textbook writing to be handed over to reliable and relatively unbiased professional historians.

It should be pointed out in passing that the zeal for collecting historical source material was not limited to the sources of secular history. In the same way that the gathering of the sources of national history was begun by Duchesne in the 17th century, so activity in collecting the sources of ecclesiastical history was initiated at this same period and has been continued to the present time. The first complete collection of the writings of the Church Fathers was gathered and published by Migne in 382 volumes between 1844 and 1864. While, like Bancroft's 'History of the Pacific States,' it was a publisher's rather than a scholar's enterprise, it has been of immense value to students. The failure of Migne to use the best texts in all cases has led to the attempt to produce better collections of Patristic literature. Since 1866 the Vienna Academy has been publishing a carefully edited collection of the writings of the Latin Fathers, and in 1897 the Berlin Academy began to issue an edition of the Greek Fathers. The collection of material dealing with the lives and deeds of the saints, which was begun by Bolland in the middle of the 17th century, is still in progress. A collection of the acts of the Church councils by Labbe and Cossart appeared in the latter half of the 17th century and was continued by Etienne Baluze in 1683. In 1685 Jean Hardouin started a new collection, and in the middle of the 18th century Mansi compiled the largest of all collections of the councils, a new edition of which is now appearing in Paris. At the same time that Mansi was preparing his collection of conciliar material Mainardi published the collection of papal bulls. In the latter half of the 19th century Jaffé and Potthast produced scholarly collections of papal 'Regesta' to the year 1304, and Kehr is now engaged in the publication of the latest and most complete compilation of this type of material. On the whole, the collections of source material for the history of the Church are fully equal if not superior to those for the secular history of Europe.

5. The Rise of Modern Critical Historical Scholarship.—Professor Gooch, in his scholarly and informing account of the development of historiography in the 19th century, points out that prior to the beginning of the last century historical science labored under four serious handicaps—the catastrophic theory of historical causation and the contempt for the mediæval period, which had characterized the rationalist school; the absence of any extensive collection of original sources; the lack of critical methods in handling historical materials; and the failure to provide for any systematic and competent teaching of the subject-matter or methods of history. It has already been pointed out how the 'Romanticists' had corrected the faults of the rationalists by insisting upon the law of continuity in historical development and by looking upon the mediæval period as the most fruitful age for historical research, and it has also been briefly shown how the pride of exuberant nationalism had led to the provision of magnificent collections of source material for

the history of every leading modern nation. It now remains to trace the rise of critical scholarship in the field of history and to show how critical methods were widely disseminated through the development of the professional teacher of history.

It was shown above that the promising rise of critical methods in the use of historical materials as an incident of humanism and exemplified in the work of Blondus, Beatus Rhenanus, Vadianus and Zurita had been checked and smothered in the fierce religious controversies of the period of the Reformation. By the latter part of the 17th century, however, the volume of polemic had tended to decline and it was again possible to assume to some extent an objective attitude and to begin a dispassionate search for truth. This development of scientific historical method passed through two natural and normal stages: first, the development of those auxiliary sciences, such as diplomatic, chronology, paleography, epigraphy and lexicography, which would enable the historian to ascertain the genuineness of a document; and, second, the growth of internal or interpretative criticism, which passes beyond the mere establishment of the authenticity of the document and examines into the degree of the credibility of its author.

The first of the above steps in the growth of modern historical science was primarily the work of those same Benedictine monks of the Congregation of Saint Maur who had been so active in the preliminary period of the collection of the sources of French history. Their priority in this movement seems to have been due to the fact that not being a militant order they did not have to appear as vigorous apologists for Catholicism and that they also had the advantage over lay writers in not being compelled to glorify a particular city, province, family or dynasty. In the quiet libraries of their monastery they brought into existence an indispensable portion of the mechanism of the modern historian. The leader of the historical scholars of the Order was Jean Mabillon (1632-1707), who created the science of diplomatic—or the critical method of determining the authenticity of documents. In 1675 a Jesuit historian, Papenbroch, made a sweeping claim that many of the documents upon which the Maurists had relied were worthless. Mabillon devoted the next six years to the preparation of his reply, and in 1681 his opponent was crushed under the erudition of the 'De re diplomatica,' which remained the standard treatise on the subject until it was displaced in the present generation by the volumes of Sickel, Fischer and Giry. The basis of modern paleography and archeology was laid by Dom Bernard Montfaucon (1655-1741) in his 'Palæographia graeca' and his 'L'Antiquité expliquée et représentée en figures.' While a layman, Charles du Fresne Du Cange had founded historical lexicography in his 'Glossarium mediae et infimæ latinitatis' (1678), the Benedictines left their impress upon this field in the famous revision of Du Cange's work by Dom Carpentier (1768). Finally, in a great co-operative work, begun by Dantine and Durand, and finished in 1790 by Dom Clément, 'L'Art de vérifier les dates,' chronology was at last taken from the hands of Eusebius and Jerome and put on a scientific foundation. Of course, the Benedic-

tines did not limit their efforts wholly to the perfecting of methods of research, but applied these methods in the production of voluminous works and source collections on Church and national history. The advance in scientific method which they brought into existence can scarcely be overestimated. Before this time there had either been no attempt to cite sources or the citations had been hopelessly confused; there had been no general practice of establishing the genuineness of a text; and there had been no hesitancy in altering the text of a document to improve the style. Now documents were searchingly examined as to their authenticity, the text was quoted with exactness, and the citations were invariably included and given with scrupulous accuracy. It is, however, easily possible to overestimate the modernity of the Maurists; they were as near to Timaeus as to Ranke or Gardiner. Their critical methods were almost entirely limited to external or textual criticism—to an examination of the genuineness of the document. They were greatly inferior to the school of Voltaire in examining the credibility of contemporary authorities and generally regarded the contents of an authentic primary source as entirely identical with absolute truth. Neither did they possess anything of the romanticist conception of historical development and the continuity and organic nature of cultural evolution. They were nearer to scientific antiquarians than to modern historians. Nor were they sceptical of ecclesiastical tradition. They labored under the pious opinion that the truth would substantiate the contentions of the Church, but in reality provided their rationalist contemporaries and successors with a supply of scholarly information with which to rout the ecclesiastics.

Almost identical in method with the Benedictines was the work of the Jansenist, Louis Sebastian de Tillemont (1637-1698), on the history of the Church and the Roman Empire to 600 A.D. His product was highly objective, being primarily a mosaic pieced together from sources which were selected to harmonize but were not altered. It was one of the earliest of modern historical works to include a critical discussion of the principal sources for each period. His solid work, designed as a pillar of Christian doctrine, was one of the chief sources used by the sceptical Gibbon. A similar example of the new erudite methods was the researches into the history of the Guelfs carried on by the German philosopher, Gottfried Wilhelm Leibnitz (1646-1716) in his 'Annals of the House of Brunswick.' A step was taken towards the development of internal criticism by the great Italian, Muratori (1672-1750), who made a number of advances over his master, Mabillon. He was as critical of miracles as Blondus and departed widely from the Benedictine practice of regarding contemporary sources as infallible. The methods of Mabillon and Muratori were combined with some faint anticipation of the romanticist conception of historical development in Rapin Thoyras' (1661-1735) 'History of England,' which long remained the chief source on the Continent for the history of 17th century England. Finally, in the co-operative 'Universal History' produced by the English scholars, Campbell, Sale, Swinton, Bower and Psalmanazar, the erudite

school published the most scholarly universal history since the humanist attempt in the 'Ennades' of Sabellicus. While thoroughly pious in its approach, it has been called by no less authoritative a critic than Fueter "the first universal history worthy of the name."

While Vadianus, Muratori and Thoyras had shown at least an embryonic power of criticizing the credibility of contemporary or "primary," sources and documents, the real beginning of the searching internal criticism of historical documents must be assigned to the work of the Jesuits. Having been put upon the defensive by the Protestant onslaughts, they were compelled to examine the sources of ecclesiastical history to discover what portion of the old traditions and legends would bear the test of scientific scrutiny. By this means they hoped to eliminate the damaging criticism of the Church by Protestant historians who ridiculed the many crude and obviously false legends connected with the Catholic past. The chief example of this Jesuit criticism was the monumental 'Acta Sanctorum,' begun by the Belgian Jesuits under Bolland's direction in 1643. Here the sources bearing on the lives of the various saints were arranged according to their age and authenticity. A much more healthy spirit of criticism was exhibited by Pierre Bayle (1647-1706) in his 'Historical and Critical Dictionary' and in his criticism of the history of Calvinism by Maimbourg. Bayle took especial delight in pointing out the grave discrepancies between the views and opinions of contemporary authorities and did not hesitate to extend his methods to the examination of "sacred" history. Since the period of humanism the historians of classical antiquity had been regarded with a reverent confidence second only to the "Fathers." Valla had questioned some assertions of Livy, but it was left for Louis de Beaufort (d. 1795) in his 'Dissertation sur l'incertitude des cinq premiers siècles de l'histoire romaine,' to prove that the divergence in the accounts of the period by the great classical authorities indicated that the history of Rome before the third century B.C. rested almost wholly on legendary material. The work of Beaufort marked a break with humanism in attitude and method as well as in style. The most obscure member of this critical school, but perhaps the ablest historian before Niebuhr was Jean Baptiste Dubos (1672-1740). His 'Histoire critique de l'établissement de la monarchie française dans les Gaules' was the first attempt to turn the new critical methods upon the study of institutions. In as objective a spirit as that exhibited by Ranke he examined the documentary sources for the early history of France and anticipated Fauriel and Coulanges in proving that the Merovingians had merely adapted and not displaced Roman culture in Gaul. He also anticipated the romanticists in possessing a grasp upon the conception of the gradual and organic development of civilization which was vastly superior to the catastrophic theory of the contemporary rationalists. In this respect he marked an advance in the direction of Möser. Less critical, but more truly historical was the 'History of Osnabrück' by Justus Möser (1720-91), regarded by many as the first real constitutional history, in that it showed the manner in which political institutions develop out of the deeper social

and economic forces in the life of a state. It was a disciple of Möser, Barthold Georges Niebuhr (1770-1831), who is conventionally regarded as the creator of modern historiography, but if the foregoing discussions have shown anything they have proved that no single personality or school can be regarded as having brought into existence the totality of modern historical science. Niebuhr, a Dane called to the new University of Berlin by Humboldt in 1810, is one of the best examples of this tendency to synthesize the progressive methods of his predecessors. He was influenced by Savigny's romanticism in the study of the evolution of legal and political institutions. He followed Möser in his profound conception of the development of political institutions. Finally, he applied to the sources of early Roman history the critical methods which had been adopted by Wolf in his epoch-making studies of the authorship of the Homeric poems. His 'Roman History' was the first book to combine the best of the newer critical methods with the constructive principles of synthetic institutional history, and it was the chief source of inspiration for the historical work of his greater successors, Leopold von Ranke and Theodor Mommsen.

Von Ranke (1795-1886) first became interested in history through his studies in classical literature, the influence of romanticism and the reading of Niebuhr. His immediate activity as a historian was initiated by his discovery of the wide divergence between the accounts of the events of the 15th century in Italian history as presented by the leading contemporary authorities. This led to the publication in 1824 of his 'History of the Romance and Germanic Peoples, 1494-1535.' Its most significant portion was the appendix, entitled 'Zur Kritik neuerer Geschichtsschreiber,' and devoted to an analysis of the sources of information for the period that he had covered. This did for internal and interpretative criticism what Mabillon's treatise on diplomatic had done for external criticism, or the critical study of texts. It was Ranke's great contribution to historical method to have insisted that the historian must not only use strictly contemporary sources of information, but must also make a thorough study of the personality, "tendencies" and activities of the author to determine as far as possible the personal equation in his record of events. There were two more fundamental characteristics in the historical mechanism of Ranke, namely, the conception derived from the romanticists that every nation and age is dominated by a prevalent set of ideas, designated by Ranke, the Zeitgeist,² and the doctrine that the historian must view the past wholly freed from the prejudices of the present and must narrate the events of the past wie es eigentlich gewesen.³ His defects have been pointed out by later writers as the failure to exhaust the sources available for any subject upon which he wrote and a primary concern with political events and dominating personalities to the neglect of the more fundamental facts of economic and social, and even of political, life. While he ranged over the entire history of Europe and the world and left an enduring mark upon every field, it was his contributions to historical methods and teaching which were mainly significant for the growth of historiog-

raphy. To historical method he contributed primarily through his formulation of the principles of internal criticism and his insistence upon entire objectivity in the treatment of the past. His influence upon historical scholarship through his teaching was probably greater than through the exemplification of his methods in his written works. That fundamental instrument for the advancement of historical scholarship in the academic world—the Historical Seminar—was founded by Ranke in 1833 and it served to train not only the leading German historians, but historical students from all over the world who came to serve in the historical laboratory which he maintained during the period of half a century. When Ranke became too aged to conduct his seminar with effectiveness, his greatest pupil, George Waitz, adopted the methods of his master at the University of Göttingen, where nearly every leading mediævalist of the last generation received at least a part of his training.

With the work of Ranke the foundations of modern historical scholarship were finally laid. The progress since his time has consisted primarily in a further refinement of critical methods and their general dissemination among a continually growing body of historical scholars. This progressive expansion of scientific historical scholarship has been in part the result of the direct imitation of Ranke's methods by his students and in part the outgrowth in every country of those same preliminary conditions and developments which made the work of Ranke possible.

In Germany the growth of the critical school of historiography was primarily the result of the work of Ranke. Among his pupils were Köpke, Jaffé, Waitz, Giesebricht and Von Sybel who perpetuated the methods of their master in their own writings and teaching. Waitz probably surpassed Ranke in the thoroughness and exactness of his scholarship. The existence of independent sources of the new scholarship is best seen in the case of Mommsen, who was a product of the same general circumstances that made the work of Ranke possible, and who fully equalled Ranke in the field of scholarship. In the generation since Droysen, Treitschke and Sybel, the works of the younger contributors to German history have shown more perfectly the objectivity of Ranke and have eliminated the errors due to the rabid patriotism of their predecessors. Moriz Ritter has produced the most detailed and scholarly treatment of the Thirty Years' War and the events of the Counter-Reformation. Bernhard Erdmannsdörffer has dealt with great scholarship and candor with the period from the Thirty Years' War to the accession of Frederick the Great and has rejected Droysen's laudatory picture of the early Hohenzollerns and their "mission." R. Koser, in what is probably the most scholarly biographical product of modern critical historiography, has removed from Frederick the Great the halo with which he was adorned by Droysen and Carlyle. The period from Jena to the Revolution of 1848 has been studied by Hans Delbrück, Max Lehmann and F. Meinecke with much greater fairness, poise and scholarship than was exhibited by Treitschke. Erich Marcks and Max Lenz have removed from Bismarck the "Sunday clothes" with which he was dressed by Sybel

and have laid bare his policies and intrigues. Alfred Stern is engaged upon what is by far the most exhaustive and scholarly history of Europe in the 19th century. Further, the influence of the *École des Chartes* in improving the exact methods of handling documents has been evident in the Germanies in the work of such men as Sickel and the foundation of the Vienna Historical Institute in 1854. The general nature of German historical scholarship as exemplified in the adoption of critical methods is best observable in the co-operative work edited by W. Oncken, 'Allgemeine Geschichte in Einzeldarstellungen'; and in the 'Jahrbücher der deutschen Geschichte,' which has been in process of publication by the Historical Commission of the Munich Academy since 1862. The most erudite and complete synthesis of scientific historical methodology ever prepared has been produced by E. Bernheim, though G. Wolf has more recently made a creditable contribution to this field. The discussion of the application of this new critical scholarship to the field of German political history should not cause one to lose sight of the fact that equal progress has been made in the field of Church history since the days of the Centurians. Interest in this subject was revived by Neander in the first half of the 19th century. In the work of Hinschius, Richter and Sohm on the canon law; Hauck's history of the German Church; the labors of Hefele and Hergenröther on the councils; Pastor's history of the Popes of the 'Renaissance'; Harnack's monumental history of Christian dogma, and Kraus' history of Christian art, are to be seen works which rank with the best products of critical political historiography.

The growth of critical historical scholarship in France owed something to German influences and some of the leading French historians, such as Monod, were trained by the German masters, but on the whole the progress of historical scholarship in France has been primarily an indigenous development. To Niebuhr might be compared Fauriel, who was the inspiration of Guizot and his associates. While Guizot never equalled Ranke with respect to exact scholarship or productivity he was far superior to Ranke in analysis and more capable and active as an editor, and his influence in stimulating historical scholarship in France was fully comparable to that exerted by Ranke in Germany. The precise scholarship of Waitz found its first French counterpart in the works of François Mignet, which foreshadowed modern French historiography, not only by their high critical standards, but also by their almost uncanny powers of causal analysis and their remarkable lucidity in exposition. The perfection of exact historical methods in France was not due to an individual, as in Germany, but to the labors of many scholars and teachers in the greatest of the world's schools for the training of historians in the refined methods of criticism, *L'École des Chartes*, which began its work in 1829. The names of Delisle, Guérard, Monod, Luchaire, Molinier, Giry and Viollet are indicative of the quality of work produced by the institution. In Aulard, France possesses a scholar whose detailed and masterly knowledge of a brief period of national history can be equalled among the

world's historians only by Gardiner, and the myths surrounding the French Revolution have at last been put to rest. The finest representative collection of French historical scholarship is to be found in the co-operative 'Histoire générale' edited by Lavisde and Rambaud and in the 'Histoire de France' edited by Lavisde. Space forbids more than a brief enumeration of some of the leading members of this recent generation of French scholars who have made the most notable contributions to historical knowledge. C. Jullian has carried the methods of his master, Coulanges, into a thorough survey of ancient Gaul under the Roman Empire. A. Berthelot has distinguished himself by studies in the later Roman Empire and the beginnings of mediæval Europe. G. Bloch has contributed some striking monographs on the transition from Roman to mediæval civilization. C. Diehl has devoted himself to the period of the revival of the Eastern Empire under Justinian. Feudalism has been analyzed by C. Seignobos and A. Luchaire. Seignobos has also rendered valuable service to modern history and to the general history of civilization, while Luchaire is the peerless authority on France of the 11th, 12th and early 13th centuries. C. Langlois has traced the decline of the Capetians. Town life in the Middle Ages has received the attention of A. Giry, who has also contributed the standard treatise on diplomatic. C. Bémont is easily the leading French student of mediæval England, though Ferdinand Lot has done notable work in early French and English mediæval history. C. Bayet holds the same place with respect to the investigation of the Mediæval Empire and has also done signal work on the Byzantine Empire. A. Coville is the master of the period of the Hundred Years' War. C. Pfister has contributed important monographs to mediæval history, the history of Nancy and the administrative policy of Henry IV. The 15th century has received the attention of C. Petit-Dutaillis. H. Lemonnier is the undisputed authority on the history of France in the 16th century. Hanotaux has analyzed the France of the opening of the 17th century. E. Lavisde has also claimed the 17th and holds the first place among French editors of co-operative historical works. H. Vast has surveyed in a brilliant fashion the political history of France in the later 17th and 18th centuries and the era of Napoleon. The 18th century has also profited by the labors of H. Carré and P. Sagnac in the political history of France and Europe, while A. Sorel has mastered the international relations of this century to an unparalleled degree. Aulard's unique work on the French Revolution has been mentioned above. A. Débidour and A. Malet have synthesized the recent scholarship dealing with France in the last century and have done notable work on the history of modern European diplomacy, while H. Mariéjol has covered the history of modern France and Spain, being especially an authority on the early Bourbons. The leading French authority on modern Germany and Austria is G. Blondel, while the similar position with respect to Hungary, Bohemia and Poland must be assigned to E. Denis and L. Léger. A. Rambaud, perhaps the most erudite and versatile figure in French historiography, has earned for himself an enviable position in

many fields. Winning his reputation by a monograph on the Byzantine Empire, he has since become the leading French authority on Slavonic Europe and has contributed brilliant surveys of French civilization and the growth of the French colonial empire. All students of the ecclesiastical and political history of Europe are immensely indebted to the masterly reviews of the relation between the Church and the State throughout the history of France by E. Chénon and Débidour. Renan has found his ablest successor in Emile Faguet whose survey of French thought cannot be matched in any other country. Nor should one forget the contributions of E. Levasseur to economic history; of P. Tannery to the history of science; and of C. Langlois to the subject of historical bibliography and methodology. The contributions of other recent French historians will be mentioned in the treatment of special phases of modern historiography. What Ranke achieved for the improvement of the teaching of history in Germany was accomplished in France by Jean Victor Duruy, Ernest Lavisse, Charles Bémont and Gabriel Monod. Monod, probably the most scholarly and stimulating teacher of history who has yet lived, brought to perfection the seminar method which had been introduced by Duruy. In conclusion, no sketch of French historical scholarship would be complete without proper recognition of the unparalleled ability of French historians to unite careful scholarship with a broad interpretation of historical material, an admirable lucidity of expression and rare powers of synthetic organization.

Even more than was the case with France, critical historical scholarship in England was a native product. Beginning in the work of such men as Freeman, Stubbs, Green, Lecky, Creighton and Seeley, it has reached its highest point in the work of Samuel Rawson Gardiner on the stirring events of the first half of the 17th century. For a thorough mastery of all the available sources for a limited period and the ability to organize these in an intelligible narrative he has but one rival, Aulard, and the objectivity of his work surpasses that of the Frenchman. The English have never, however, provided anything comparable to the *École des Chartes* or the Historical Institute at Vienna for the training of young historians in the most recent methods of exact critical scholarship. The great repertory of the best products of recent English historical scholarship is the co-operative works — the incomplete 'Cambridge Mediaeval History,' the 'Cambridge Modern History,' and the less pretentious series edited by Hunt and Oman. Any catalogue of the modern leaders of English critical historical scholarship would certainly include the following names. N. H. Baynes has dealt with the Eastern Roman Empire, a field which has been more extensively cultivated by J. B. Bury, whose thorough and versatile scholarship has also been demonstrated by work on the later Roman Empire, by his critical edition of Gibbon and by his planning of the 'Cambridge Mediaeval History.' The mediaeval history of both England and continental Europe has profited by the labors of C. W. Oman, who has also distinguished himself in the field of modern history by a comprehensive work on the Peninsular War. H. C. W. Davis, one of the

most brilliant of the younger present-day mediævalists, has contributed notable work on the whole field of mediæval history, but particularly upon the 11th and 12th centuries. T. F. Tout has dealt with England in the 13th and 14th centuries, as well as with the relations between the Church and empire in the Middle Ages, from a broad and well-balanced point of view. J. H. Round has exhibited exceptional scholarship by his studies of English feudalism and mediæval legal institutions. The work of the late F. W. Maitland on the social interpretation of English legal institutions marked the greatest advance in that field since the time of Stubbs. The work of James Bryce on the Mediæval Empire has never been superseded, though H. A. L. Fisher has more recently turned to that subject with both insight and scholarship. Ernest Barker has contributed a number of scholarly monographs on diverse phases of mediæval history. G. M. Trevelyan has dealt with England in both the 14th and the 17th centuries in works which not only exhibit original scholarship, but also the finest mastery of English prose to be found among critical English historians of the present day. The careful scholarship of Richard Lodge has been displayed in the treatment of the transition from the mediæval to the modern period in both England and continental Europe. J. A. Doyle's account of English colonization in America is, perhaps, surpassed only by the American work of Professor Osgood. James Gairdner's calm and scholarly work on the 15th century and the Tudor period has been carried on by A. D. Innes, H. A. L. Fisher and A. F. Pollard, the latter one of the most original and promising writers now engaged in the field of English history. G. W. Prothero has sketched the later 16th century and has secured for himself a position as an historical editor comparable to that held in France by Lavisse. It is a sufficient commentary on the work of C. H. Firth on the history of the middle of the 17th century to observe that the scholarship of Gardiner has not suffered in the work of his continuator. That Lecky's great work on the 18th century did not doom his successors to barren efforts is shown by the works of L. S. Leadam and W. Hunt, C. G. Robertson's narrative on the early Hanoverians, G. O. Trevelyan's survey of the American Revolution and by the biographies of the elder Pitt by Rosebury and Williams, of Burke by Morley, of Fox by Trevelyan and of the younger Pitt by Rose. Stanley Leathes has no English competitor as an authority on the political history of France. F. C. Montague and J. R. M. Macdonald have investigated the history of 18th century France, and H. Morse Stephens contributed the first scholarly synthesis of the French Revolution before he left his native-land to win academic distinction in the United States. J. H. Rose is the undisputed English authority on the Napoleonic period, while H. A. L. Fisher has been attracted by Napoleon's administrative reforms. The 19th century has been covered by the works of Spencer Walpole, Herbert Paul, G. Slater and J. A. R. Marriott and by a number of notable biographies, such as those of Francis Place by Graham Wallas, of Cobden and Gladstone by Morley, of Bright by G. M. Trevelyan and of Disraeli by Monypenny and Buckle. The history of the British Empire has

received detailed attention from Egerton, Lucas Innes and H. H. Johnston. European politics and international relations in the last century have been dealt with by W. A. Phillips, G. L. Dickinson and J. A. R. Marriott. In addition, there should be mentioned the exhaustive scholarship of A. W. Ward with respect to all things connected with the political history of modern Germany and the detailed studies of W. H. Dawson on the modern German Empire; the scholarly work of R. N. Bain, R. W. Seton-Watson, D. M. Wallace, F. H. Skrine and W. Miller on Scandinavian, Slavonic and eastern Europe; the studies of Italian unification by Bolton King and G. M. Trevelyan; and the comprehensive work of Martin Hume on modern Spain. Church history has not been neglected in England, the more notable products in this field being the works of H. M. Gwatkin and F. J. Foakes-Jackson on the early Church; of H. B. Workman on the Medieval Church and the preliminaries of the Reformation; of C. Beard and T. M. Lindsay on the Reformation in general, and of James Gairdner and R. W. Dixon on the Reformation in England; of R. W. Church and F. W. Cornish on the religious movements of the last century; of H. W. Clark on the Non-Conformists; and the monumental co-operative history of Stephens and Hunt on the whole period of English ecclesiastical history. The contributions of Cunningham and Ashley to economic history and of Morley, Stephen, Benn and Merz to intellectual history will be dealt with in another place. Finally, no student of historiography could fail to commend G. P. Gooch for his excellent execution of Lord Acton's long-deferred plan to sketch the development of modern historical writing. Of the teachers of history in England who have done the most to inspire their pupils with the ideals of modern criticism and with an interest in historical investigation Freeman, Seeley, Actor and Maitland have had the widest and most salutary influence.

The beginning of modern critical scholarship in the field of American history dates back only to about the period of the close of the American Civil War. It owed its origin very largely to the influence of Germany. In the first quarter of the 19th century George Bancroft had attended the lectures of Heeren and had later been a friend of Ranke. Not having been an academician, Bancroft had little influence on scientific historical methods in the United States. The real beginning of the systematic introduction of the improved methods of German historical scholarship into the United States began in the year 1857 when Henry Torrey succeeded Sparks at Harvard, Francis Lieber assumed his professorship at Columbia, and Andrew D. White accepted a chair of history at Michigan. All of these men had been trained in Germany and established a direct contact between German and American scholarship. Professor White had also been profoundly influenced by Guizot, and his teaching was never limited to the narrowly episodical and political history which attracted the extreme disciples of Ranke and the Prussian school. A still greater impulse to the sound establishment of historical scholarship in America came when Herbert Baxter Adams instituted the teaching of history in Johns Hopkins University in 1876 immediately after

the conclusion of his studies in Göttingen, Berlin and Heidelberg. To Prof. H. B. Adams was due not only the establishment of the "seminar" method of instruction in America, but also the organization and creation of the first great training school for historians in America. There is scarcely a great American university at the present day which does not have in its department of history one or more men trained in the Johns Hopkins seminar, and the literary products of this seminar were the first conspicuous exemplification in America of the newer critical historical scholarship. Much the greatest personal influence in the introduction of the German methods and ideals was that of Professor John William Burgess, who began his work at Amherst in 1873 after having studied in Göttingen, Leipzig and Berlin and who founded in 1880 the famous faculty of political science at Columbia, which came to rival and later to overshadow Johns Hopkins. Professor Adams, while appreciating the value of the exact German methods, had a healthy confidence in the ability of American scholars to interpret and apply the new methods, but Professor Burgess was convinced that at best Americans could be but lame and halting imitators of Germanic genius and induced most of his students to finish their studies in Germany. As Prof. H. B. Adams has expressed it, "The students of Professor Burgess went to Berlin in shoals. They went in such numbers that they began to be called the 'Burgess School.' They all went to hear Droysen lecture; and came home with trunks full of Droysen's 'Preussische Politik' and of the writings of Leopold von Ranke." In addition to the work of Johns Hopkins and Columbia, Michigan advanced the new methods under Charles K. Adams, and Cornell under President White, Moses Coit Tyler and George Lincoln Burr. About this same time Edward Channing, at Harvard, carried to completion the beginnings in the newer historical scholarship which had been made by Henry Adams in the "seventies." At the present time the new scholarship has permeated the whole American university world and the American students of history need no longer, as Professor Gooch would seem to indicate, seek their training abroad. In the seminars of such scholars as Herbert L. Osgood, William A. Dunning, George Burton Adams, J. F. Jameson, Frederick Jackson Turner, George Lincoln Burr, Edward Channing, Edward G. Bourne, Dana C. Munro and Charles H. Haskins the serious American student has received or may receive training in refined critical methods quite equal in most respects to anything to be obtained abroad. The French influences have to some degree displaced the German in recent years and most American mediævalists finish their training in the *École des Chartes*, a substitute for which scarcely exists in America. A number of American scholars, such as H. B. Adams, E. G. Bourne, B. A. Hinsdale, N. M. Trenholme, F. M. Flig, Henry Johnson, H. E. Bourne, W. H. Mace, J. M. Vincent and F. H. Foster, have made worthy contributions to the systematic elaboration of historical methodology, but nothing has appeared in this field in America that in any way rivals the works of Bernheim or Langlois and Seignobos. Any account of the introduction of the modern methods of historical re-

search in America would be incomplete without some mention of the work of Prof. Albert Bushnell Hart of Harvard. While he has not contributed notably to the further refinement of critical methodology in historiography by his own works, there can be no doubt that he has been easily the leader in promoting the production of scholarly contributions to the field of American history and government, in his capacity as an editor, and in popularizing the more scholarly methods.

The application of the more critical methods to the field of American history has resulted in works worthy to rank with the best European products and has quite reconstructed the earlier notions of American national development. The period of colonization has been examined by Professor Osgood a student of Professor Burgess and Ranke, and his monumental seven volume work on the American Colonies constitutes the highest point to which exact American scholarship has attained, and is worthy to rank with the writings of Gardiner and Aulard. The relation of the colonies to British foreign policy has been recast by Professor Osgood's disciple, George Louis Beer. Professor Alvord, in a scholarly and original work, has for the first time shown the full significance of the problems of British imperial administration west of the Alleghenies for the preliminaries of the American Revolution, and has finally rescued the study of the beginnings of that conflict from the octopus of Boston Harbor. Fisher, Flick, Siebert, Tyler and Van Tyne have at last dealt fairly with the Loyalists. The study of the period of the formation and adoption of the American constitution has finally been secularized through the detailed and critical research of Prof. Max Farrand and the brilliant essay of Professor Beard. Professor McMaster has surveyed the first 70 years of national development with not only scholarship, but a broader and more synthetic approach than has been attained in any other comprehensive American historical work. Much more superficial and narrow in its scope, but equally scholarly is Henry Adams' detailed account of American foreign policy in the administrations of Jefferson and Madison. Professor Turner and his students have applied something of the scholarship of Osgood and the originality and the breadth of interest of McMaster to a study of the colonization of the West, and their work has in many ways superseded the vigorous and interesting survey by Roosevelt. Professor Turner's "school" is the best illustration in America of the combination of exact scholarship with the synthetic tendency in modern historiography. The period of the Civil War and Reconstruction has been dealt with in a calm and temperate fashion by Mr. James Ford Rhodes in a detailed work which for objectivity and scholarship furnishes the only rival to that of Professor Osgood. The same period and the subsequent generation have been covered in an exhaustive manner by Professor Dunning and his students. Dr. E. P. Oberholzer, a disciple of Professor McMaster, has made a promising beginning in the attempt to present a detailed analysis of the history of the people of the United States since the Civil War, interpreted in the original and comprehensive spirit of his master. The

whole period of national history has been sketched in a careful and dispassionate manner by James Schouler, and Professor Channing is engaged on an ambitious attempt to trace the history of the United States from the period of colonization to the present in a work designed to synthesize the results of the critical studies of the present generation of historical scholars, and which, if completed, bids fair to become the great national history in the better sense of that term. The character of the best American historical scholarship in the first generation of those who had imbibed the newer critical methods is to be discovered in the co-operative "Narrative and Critical History of America," edited by Justin Winsor. A much more comprehensive and representative repertoire of American scholarship of a slightly more recent type is to be found in the "American Nation," edited by Professor Albert Bushnell Hart. In addition to investigation of the history of their own country, American historians have made important contributions to many other periods and phases of history. Professor Breasted has earned a place among the leaders of modern Egyptology and Rogers, Hilprecht, Jastrow, Olmstead and Goodspeed have done creditable work on the history of Babylonia and Assyria. Professor Ferguson is the world's foremost authority on Hellenistic Athens, Westermann has dealt in an original fashion with the provinces of the Roman imperial system, and Botsford ranged over the whole period of classical antiquity with both insight and the most exacting scholarship. In the field of mediæval history Professor Burr has mastered the Carolingian period and is easily the leading authority in Europe or America on the history of toleration; Larson has investigated the early mediæval history of England and Thompson has dealt with the growth of the French monarchy under Louis VI; Munro had devoted himself particularly to a study of the Crusades; the part played by the Normans in the history of mediæval Europe has been investigated by Haskins with a thoroughness not equalled by any other American or European scholar; few if any English scholars can rival G. E. Adams' knowledge of the constitutional history of mediæval England; Henderson has summarized the results of modern scholarship dealing with mediæval Germany; Emerton has contributed scholarly and detailed manuals covering the entire mediæval period; Lynn Thorndike has recently presented an original synthesis of the best modern scholarship dealing with the Middle Ages, and H. O. Taylor has furnished the best survey of the intellectual history of this period. The original and now generally accepted thesis that the "commercial revolution" rather than the "Renaissance" or the "Reformation" marked the dawn of the modern world has furnished the centre of orientation for the stimulating works of Abbott, Shepherd, E. G. Bourne, Merriman and Cheyney. The French Revolution and the Napoleonic period have profited by the works of H. M. Stephens, Fling, Sloane, H. E. Bourne and Johnston. Thayer has written in an interesting fashion on the history of Italy from the end of the Napoleonic régime to the completion of unification; Henderson, Schewill, Ford and Fay have treated the history of modern Germany; Lyber has been the only American

historian to devote special attention to the modern history of southeastern Europe; and C. M. Andrews and Hazen have contributed standard political narratives on the history of modern Europe. In Prof. John Bassett Moore the United States has the most productive and authoritative student of the history of international law and diplomacy, and D. J. Hill, J. W. Foster, A. C. Coolidge, C. R. Fish and E. S. Corwin have been some of the other American writers who have contributed to this field. Church history has attracted a large number of American students. H. C. Lea's monographs have entitled him to rank with European scholars like Harnack and Duchesne. G. P. Fisher and Philip Schaff sketched the whole history of the Christian Church. McGiffert won an international reputation by his edition of Eusebius and has since made important contributions to the history of the early Church. The rise of the mediæval Church has received the attention of Ayer and Flick. The period of the "Reformation" has been covered by the monographs of Preserved Smith, Emer-
ton, Faulkner, Jackson and Jacobs. W. Walker has provided a survey of Church history in both Europe and America. David Schaff, S. M. Jackson and W. W. Rockwell have contributed to this field by valuable editorial labors, and Professor Rockwell has been especially active in keeping Americans in touch with the latest developments in European scholarship in this field. The primary attention of European historians to ancient and mediæval history—a lingering effect of humanism and romanticism—has left its impress upon American scholarship and has led to a neglect of modern history. The younger generation of American historians, however, by devoting their energies primarily to modern history, have tended to make a salutary break with tradition and are promising to equal in volume and quality the contributions that their former teachers made to the study of the "Middle Ages."

Historical biography in the United States has tended to take the form of a great number of brief biographies, such as the "American Statesmen Series" and the "Riverside Biographical Series," rather than being limited to a few notable products. Some fine biographies have appeared, however, such as the voluminous documentary biography of Lincoln by Nicolay and Hay, the excellent biographies of Buchanan and Webster by G. T. Curtis, and the more recent ones of Douglas by Allen Johnson, of Andrew Jackson by J. S. Bassett, and of Stephen Girard by J. B. McMaster.

XI. THE INDUSTRIAL AND SCIENTIFIC REVOLUTIONS AND THE LEADING TENDENCIES IN MODERN HISTORIOGRAPHY.

1. The Persistence and Development of Earlier Trends.—While the major portion of the progress in historiography since Ranke has consisted in rise of new and sounder tendencies there have been important improvements in the earlier and traditional lines of development.

In the first place, while little has been achieved that was not implicit in the methodological system of Ranke, there have been some important improvements in both the critique and the technique of historical methodology since Ranke's time. The fundamental principles of historical criticism have been refined and

systematized in the admirable works of Bernheim and Langlois and Seignobos, so that the beginner may now have at his disposal a more extended discussion of all phases of historical method than Ranke was ever acquainted with. There has also been a great improvement in the mechanical accessories of historical scholarship. Elaborate bibliographies of the historiography of the various countries have been prepared, of which those by Langlois, Molinier, Monod, Dahlmann-Waitz and Gross are the more notable. These are supplemented by current lists of the new works which appear, published in the various technical historical journals, and the student is enabled to keep thoroughly abreast of the literature in his field. Remarkably thorough and accurate guides to the vast collections of sources of national and ecclesiastical history which were gathered during the 19th century have been provided, and the modern student may locate in a few minutes in any great library sources which might have occupied any earlier generation in months of fruitless searching. Of this invaluable type of aid the monumental works of Pothast and Chevalier are most worthy of mention. Again, archives, public and private, have been opened more freely to the historical scholar, though he is still excluded from the more recent material. Nor should one neglect to point out the great contribution to efficiency, expedition and accuracy in historical investigation which has come about from the general introduction of card catalogues, filing systems, loose-leaf note books and elaborate schemes for indexing and cross-reference. This important type of innovation and improvement has been chiefly the work of American scholars. As important as the advances in bibliographical and other mechanical aids has been the great extension and improvement of the teaching profession in the department of history. Under the guidance of trained scholars, the members of historical seminars, though of mediocre literary talent may contribute more exact knowledge to the field of history in their dissertations than was contained in many volumes of the older and popular literary history. Finally, historical science has, after two centuries of delay, followed the lead of natural science and become co-operative in the true sense of the word. National historical societies have been formed in all the leading countries, each supporting one or more technical journals. It is also rare now that a single authoritative historian attempts a comprehensive survey of a wide field of history; it has rather come to be the general practice to produce extensive histories on the co-operative plan in order to utilize to the full the ability of specialists. It would seem that historiography can make little more progress in the refinement of critical methodology. It only remains to bring modern history as far as possible under the control of the same exact apparatus of research that has already been provided for mediæval and church history.

A less salutary type of persistence of older tendencies has been the perpetuation of the political fetish of Ranke and his school. A number of causes have accounted for this rather curious survival of a strange distortion of historical interests. In the first place, a great impulse was given to the political orienta-

tion through the students and disciples of Ranke who held steadfastly to the tenets of their master. This was superseded in Germany by the more violent nationalism and political predilection of Droysen, Treitschke, Von Sybel and the others of the Prussian school. The rise of nationalism and political interests in France under the Third Republic kept alive the earlier nationalistic political history that had before been stimulated by the interest in the episodes of the French Revolution and the conquests of Napoleon. In England the universal conviction as to the supreme political capacity of the Anglo-Saxon seemingly imposed a moral obligation upon English historians to concentrate their attention upon the proofs of this superiority. In America the political and episodical historiography was stimulated by the thrills of a great and successful war in behalf of national unity and was perpetuated by the introduction of the tenets of Ranke and Droysen by their returning pupils, who became the leaders and organizers of historical study in this country. Finally, this type of history received a last source of inspiration from the recrudescence of nationalism throughout the world as an inevitable accompaniment of the imperialism or "neo-mercantilism" which developed more or less universally in the period of the "seventies" and the following years. That the adherents of this form of history will gain at least momentary strength and encouragement from the revived importance of nationalism and militarism growing out of the present World War is scarcely to be doubted.

2. New Developments in the Study and Interpretation of History.—Important as has been the further development of earlier tendencies in historiography during the 19th century, this has been dwarfed into insignificance by the great advances made in totally new directions or in channels which had been only slightly foreshadowed and anticipated in earlier epochs. The critical political historians provided modern historiography with its accurate methods of research and its vast compilations of primary sources. But, as Professor Shotwell has very aptly said, these scholars were so intensely absorbed in the task of perfecting the methodology of research that they failed to discriminate in the importance of the events which they narrated. It has become the task of an ever-increasing group of progressive historians to promote the synthetic tendency in the hope of giving history a more natural content and a better balanced body of subject-matter. While there can be no doubt that the basis for many of the new developments was laid by the progress of earlier periods in the way of creating the national constitutional state, expanding the European consciousness throughout the world by the commercial revolution, and encroaching upon the field of the mysterious through the great scientific discoveries in the field of natural science during the 17th and 18th centuries, there can be no question that most of the novel elements introduced into the writing and the outlook of the historian in the last century were the product of the vast transformations in social conditions and intellectual interests and attitudes since the first quarter of the 19th century. The chief reason for the great transformation in the historical outlook in the last century has been the fact

that the "Industrial Revolution" and the progress in natural and social science have completely altered not only the material conditions of human life, but also the whole "Weltanschauung" of the civilized world. A more complete reconstruction of the whole mode of life and of the intellectual orientation of civilized peoples has been achieved in the last century than had previously taken place since the beginning of the Christian era, and this great change could not but affect historical concepts viewed as an important branch of intellectual interests.

By the industrial revolution, which was effected between 1750 and 1850, the whole basis of life was profoundly modified and the former ideas and interests quite uprooted and dislocated. The old period of rural stability and repetition was broken up and with the growth of cities the possibilities of invention, imitation and progress were immensely increased. The changes in the centres of population and in the mode of life gave rise to new and strange social problems on a scale hitherto unknown, and demanded the provision of some adequate "science of society" to serve as a guide in their solution. As in the period of the so-called "Renaissance," humanity again loomed larger than the state and social rather than purely political interests forged to the front in historical as in other social sciences.

Not less consequential and epoch-making were the notable advances in natural science in the 19th century which were much more destructive to the traditional philosophy of life than the great discoveries of the 16th and 17th centuries, in that the scientific work of the earlier period centered chiefly in the realm of mechanics and other fields which did not directly concern the problem of the origin and destiny of man, while those of the 19th century had a direct and inevitable bearing upon the interpretation of the derivation and origin of the human race and its relation to the rest of the organic world. Lyell and his fellow geologists revealed the undreamed-of antiquity of the earth and of various forms of animal life. Lawrence, Lamarck, Chambers, Darwin and Wallace, working from both geology and biology, suggested and later proved the gradual and "natural" development of man from the lower varieties of the animal kingdom. The chronology of Africanus, Eusebius and Jerome was discredited for all time through the revelations of pre-historic archaeology in the hands of Boucher de Perthes and Sir John Evans, and the 'Chronicle' of Jerome was replaced by the 'Classification ethnologique' of de Mortillet. "Adam" was reduced, in the new perspective of time, from the originator of the race to a fairly close contemporary of Darwin himself. Man was revealed as the product of natural causes and not of a mysterious creation, in the old and obscurantist sense of the term, and he became, thereby, a legitimate subject for analysis, particularly at the hands of psychology. Along with this progress in natural science went a much further development of critical philosophy and the subjection of scriptural authority and sacred history, already weakened by the established conclusions of scientific investigations, to the same candid and critical investigation which has been accorded to secular history much earlier. The spirit of

Voltaire, Hume and Gibbon had at last permanently come to its own.

It was inevitable that these sweeping alterations in man's outlook upon life should profoundly affect his attitude toward the study of the past, as well as his interests in the present and future. In view of the fact that the industrial revolution was the prime mover in the social transformations of the period it was not surprising that the first vigorous reaction against the conventional political historiography should come through the avenue of a greater emphasis upon the economic factors and the commonplace facts of daily life, the primary importance of which was demonstrated by the historical events of the 19th century. To be sure, the rationalist school had laid considerable stress upon economic influences, Heeren had shown the importance of the commercial activities of antiquity, and Möser had insisted upon the vital relation of economic factors to the development of political organization, but these were only isolated instances of more than the usual contemporary insight and profundity which were almost totally overshadowed and engulfed in the episodical and biographical historiography of romanticism and in the political bias of nationalistic historiography. Economic history, as a general and universal movement of revolt from the narrow political historiography, dates from the publication of Karl Marx's pamphlet entitled, the 'Holy Family,' in 1845, and his joint work with Engels three years later, the 'Communist Manifesto.' While few of the leading figures in modern economic history would defend the economic determinism of Marx, they would at least contend that economic events have an historical significance not second to any other category of facts, and that to pass over them in silence, as did writers like Droysen and Sybel, Stubbs and Freeman, and Burgess and Holst, is to miss much of the significance of any period and inevitably to yield but an imperfect and distorted picture of any epoch. It is important to note that the new economic history was not a break with the exact scholarship of the school of Ranke, but was rather an application of critical scholarship to the recovery of our knowledge of the economic life of the past in its relation to the totality of civilization. In the names of Roscher, Knies, Inama-Sternegg, Nitzsch, Schmoller and Bucher in Germany; of Rogers, Cunningham, Ashley, Gibbons, Hammond and Webb in England; of Levasseur, LePlay, Leroy-Beaulieu, Avenel and Jaurès and his associates in France; of Kovalëvsky and Vinogradoff from Russia; and of Bolles, Veblen, Bogart, Coman, Dewey, Clark, Commons, Gay, Calleender and Day in America, the student of historiography recognizes scholars worthy to rank with the best disciples of Ranke in the field of critical methodology. In addition to the epoch-making work of the avowed economic historians, this new emphasis upon economic factors in history has filtered into the works of the orthodox school, and few serious historical works are now attempted which do not give at least grudging recognition to the importance of the industrial and commercial life of a people.

Another important new development in historical writing which grew more or less directly out of the effects of the industrial revolution was the origin of sociology and the influence of

the sociological point of view upon historical writing. While there had been sociological tendencies in the writings of earlier publicists and historians, it is generally agreed that the science of sociology had its origin in the necessity of providing a general "science of society" to criticize, evaluate and guide the various reform movements which sprang into existence as a result of the evils of the social and economic transition which accompanied the industrial revolution. Its two great original systematizers were Auguste Comte and Herbert Spencer. The influence of sociology upon history has been varied and profound. One aspect of this influence was evident in Buckle's avowed desire to follow Comte's suggestion of the existence of well defined laws of historical development and to combine this with Quetelet's statistical method of measuring social phenomena, and thus to arrive at an exact science of historical development wholly comparable to the precision reached in natural science. While Buckle's suggestions have been only moderately developed, it has long since been recognized that few valid laws of historical development can be discovered which do not rest upon the firm basis of adequate statistical study. A much more far-reaching reaction of sociology upon historiography has been its influence in broadening the content of history, so as to include all of the important phases of social life and activity. This type of departure from orthodox procedure gained its first great success in the world famous work of John Richard Green. Less popular but equally able were Professor Dill's volumes on the social phases of Roman imperial history. While Green found few immediate followers among his countrymen, who, with the exception of Lecky, for the time being held faithfully to the canons of Freeman, Stubbs and Seeley, the younger generation, led by such scholars as Pollard, Marvin, Zimmern and Slater have organized a powerful movement in favor of a revival of Green's broad social mode of approach to historical problems. Germany has probably been most prolific in the production of historians affected by the sociological movement. In the middle of the last century Richl and Freytag gathered data for the first comprehensive picture of the social history of Germany, Friedländer described the social life of the Roman Empire, and Buckhardt drew the classic picture of the civilization of the Renaissance. A quarter of a century later Janssen, from a warmly Catholic standpoint, described the social conditions of Germany in the epoch of the Reformation. Erman provided the first reliable and comprehensive account of the civilization of ancient Egypt. The great impulse to social history in Germany, however, came through the labors of the able Leipzig professor, Karl Lamprecht, and his supporters and co-workers Gothein, Steinhausen and Breyssig. In France the effect of the new social impulses has been less apparent because the French historians have never been so narrowly political as the German and English schools of history—even such technical and ultra-critical medievalists as Luchaire, Giry and Monod finding time to discuss social conditions in the medieval period. Rambaud is probably the nearest French counterpart to Green. The far greater breadth of view in French historiography than in English can best be appreciated by a comparison of

the tables of contents of the 'Histoire générale' and the 'Histoire de France' with those of the 'Cambridge Mediaeval History' and the 'Cambridge Modern History.' In Italy, Ferrero has upheld the social point of view in his history of ancient Rome. Worthy and successful imitations of Green's sociological mode of interpretation are to be found also in Blok's 'History of the Dutch People,' and in Kluchevsky's publication of his lectures on the development of the Russian national culture and political organization. Among American historians McMaster has followed most faithfully in the footsteps of Green, and Turner has exhibited a breadth of view not less notable than his exacting scholarship in tracing the colonization of the West. Cheyney's work in the field of English history has always been marked by a broad and well-balanced interpretation. Nor should one forget the promising beginnings in a social interpretation of American history by such writers as W. E. Dodd and Carl Becker, and the application of similar methods to modern European history by Hayes, Lingelbach and others. Professors Brested and Jastrow have done notable work in reconstructing the civilization of oriental antiquity. Finally, Professor Shotwell of Columbia, while his own written contributions have not been extensive, has rivalled Maitland in stimulating an enthusiastic interest in social history on the part of an ever increasing group of disciples. Another very significant outgrowth of the sociological movement has been its reaction upon the field of constitutional history. While Möser had anticipated the recent movement in stressing the creative influence of social and economic forces in shaping political forms and institutions, the first great modern school, of constitutional historians, represented in Germany by Waitz and Gneist, in England by Stubbs, and in America by Holst and Burgess, had been content to trace constitutional development in a purely external and formal legalistic manner, or had represented it as a product of the influences of powerful personalities. The spirit of Möser first reappeared in the uncompleted work of Alexis de Tocqueville on the constitutional developments in 18th century France, which forever discredited the cataclysmic interpretation of the French Revolution by showing how it was the natural and logical culmination of fundamental social and economic forces which had been operating for centuries. A similar mode of approach was evident in the brilliant contributions of Fustel de Coulanges to the constitutional history of France in the early mediaeval period. The influence of social and psychic forces in legal and constitutional history was fully recognized in Otto Gierke's monumental work on "Genossenschaftsrecht," perhaps, the most notable German contribution to the newer tendencies in constitutional interpretation, and also in Brunner's monumental history of early Germanic law and Ihering's extensive studies in comparative jurisprudence. What Tocqueville and Coulanges accomplished for France was achieved for English constitutional history by the powerful, original and unbiased mind of Gierke's disciple, Frederick W. Maitland, who for the first time effectively demonstrated the social and economic background of English legal history and made clear the futility of a purely legalistic recon-

struction of constitutional development. Maitland's work in English legal history has been carried on by his friend, Paul Vinogradoff, with a more impressive, if less subtle, scholarship, and with equal productivity. In America a worthy disciple of Maitland has appeared in Prof. Charles A. Beard, who not only shares Maitland's approach to constitutional problems, but rivals him in his disregard of traditional and orthodox opinions.

A direct outgrowth of the industrial revolution which has been of the utmost significance for both historical events and historiography has been the neo-mercantilism or national imperialism which has developed since about 1875 as a result of the need for new markets and investment opportunities which was created by the increase of both commodities and capital through the great revolution in industry between 1800 and 1875. The process has repeated in a much more thorough-going way the commercial revolution of three centuries earlier. European civilization was again brought into contact with different cultures of every conceivable type, and the possession of the scientific knowledge that had been accumulating since 1650 was of the greatest value and assistance in appropriating the new discoveries. The reactions of this movement upon historiography have been nearly as diverse as the civilizations and cultures which have been discovered. Its more unfortunate results have been a perpetuation of ardent national sentiment in historical writing and a stimulation of racial egoism on the part of European and American historians. Its more favorable effects upon historiography, as exhibited in the writings of the more thoughtful historians, have been a broadening of the knowledge of mankind, the enriching of the stores of historical information, an increase of tolerance for cultures different from our own and the great stimulation of the attention of the historian and publicist to the new social, economic and administrative problems created and to their solution in harmony with the principles of enlightenment and humanity. Among the historians and publicists who have given especial attention to these subjects have been Bryce, Douglas, Hobhouse, Hobson, Johnston, Keltie, Kidd, Lewin, Macdonald, Rose and Skrine in England; Bordier, Cordier, Gaffarel, Leroy-Beaupré, Piquet and Rambaud in France; Meinecke, Meyer, Peters and Zimmermann in Germany; and Blakeslee, Harris, Hornbeck, Jones, Keller, Krehbiel, Latourette, Morris, Reisch and Shepherd in America. On the whole, the movement has tended to broaden the historical outlook not only with respect to geographical space, but also with regard to the scope of the historian's interests. Especially significant has been the interest that it has aroused in the history of international relations.

A further significant innovation, which was in part a product of the concentration of population due to the industrial revolution and in part an outgrowth of the more scientific approach to the study of social and psychic phenomena, has been the rise of social psychology and its reaction upon history. Voltaire had foreshadowed the psychological interpretation by his doctrine of "the genius of a people," but this concept in the hands of Voltaire was essentially non-historical. He regarded national character as something fixed and immutable,

and he made little attempt to explain its origin. The romanticists had improved somewhat on Voltaire's conception by viewing the development of civilization as the product of obscure psychic or spiritual forces, but they even denied the possibility of discovering or analyzing the nature or operation of this process of psychic causation. Ranke and his school had borrowed from the romanticists the doctrine of the "Zeitgeist," but they had been content to describe its varied manifestations in different periods and made no attempt to analyze its content or to account for its origin or mutations. With the growth of cities and the means of communication during the industrial revolution and the resulting increase of social contacts and of the volume of psychic interstimulation, and with the development of modern science with its emphasis upon the amenability of human activities to psychological analysis, there gradually arose a science of collective or social psychology, which first made its appearance in the work of Lewes, Bagehot, Lazarus and Steinthal and was developed by Wundt and Dilthey in Germany; by Fouillée, Guyau, Tarde, Durkheim and Le Bon in France, by Sigele in Italy; by McDougall, Trotter and Wallas in England; and by Giddings, Sumner, Ross, Cooley and Ellwood in America. While this novel development of psychology was at first applied either to abstract or contemporary problems, it soon began to react upon historical interpretations. If the collective psychology was so all-important a factor in recent times it was natural for the original historian to ask the question as to why it had not been of fundamental significance in every age. From a semi-obscure view of a "Weltgeist" and a "Zeitgeist," which were either held to be unanalyzable or were left without analysis, the progressive historians turned to an attempt to discover and evaluate the factors which have produced the particular collective psychology of various ages and peoples, and to an effort to account for the transformations of intellectual reactions through the centuries. This line of approach was foreshadowed by Comte's famous formulation of the three stages of the development of psychic reactions. The transition from romanticism to the more scientific collective psychological approach was best exemplified by Taine, who was never quite able to free himself from the obscure trends of romanticism. The first and the most distinguished exponent of this newer line of approach to the interpretation of history through the genetic study of the transformation of the collective psychology was the original Leipzig professor, Karl Lamprecht, who not only set forth an elaborate theoretical justification of his methods, but also illustrated them in a monumental survey of German history. Lamprecht's principles have been valiantly defended by some enthusiastic and progressive scholars in every civilized country. While the avowed exponents of the value of an interpretation of history in terms of the changing attitudes of the intellectual classes have as yet been relatively few, the volume of literature which has been produced by them and others which serves to substantiate their thesis has already become considerable. In England Lecky's youthful but brilliant study of the development of rationalism in modern times; John Morley's voluminous

appreciation of the contributions of the French "Philosophes" of the 18th century; Leslie Stephen's masterly sketch of the intellectual history of England in the same period; Poole's study of mediæval thought; the solid contributions of Barker, Figgis and Carlyle to political thought from classical to modern times; the studies in the history of the heroic struggle against obscurantism which have been produced by Bury, McCabe and Robertson; A. W. Benn's survey of English rationalism in the last century; and, above all, J. T. Merz's monumental exposition of the progress of thought and science in 19th century Europe, have been the more notable examples of the growing estimate of the significance of intellectual history. All students of historiography and intellectual history are indebted to the Scotch savant, Robert Flint, for erudite contributions to the history of the philosophy of history. In Germany the more important contributions to this new field have been the massive work of Theodor Gomperz on Greek thought; the brilliant and original contributions of Wilhelm Dilthey and Wilhelm Windelband to the history of philosophy; Adolph Harnack's unique study of the development of Christian dogma; Otto Gierke's great survey of the evolution of certain phases of political theory; and the studies in the history of sociological thought by Paul Barth and Ludwig Stein. France has been creditably represented by the essays of Renan and Émile Faguet; the stimulating studies of the development of human thought from primitive times to the present by L. Lévy-Bruhl; the many brilliant monographs of Emile Durkheim and his school on the most diverse phases of intellectual history; Solomon Reinach's encyclopedic contributions to every department of the history of thought and culture; and the notable works of A. Franck, Faguet and Paul Janet in the field of the history of political theory. In Italy Vico has found a worthy successor in Benedetto Croce, and the Scandinavian nations are ably represented by the labors of Georg Brandes and Harold Höllding. In America this fertile field was first cultivated by John W. Draper, whose once popular works have long since become antiquated. The most widely read American work on intellectual history was Andrew Dickson White's powerful polemic against obscurantism, which probably did more than any other single influence to bring American thought into a proper orientation with the progress of modern science and criticism in every field. Since that time Mr. Henry Osborn Taylor has provided the public with a scholarly survey of the intellectual history of Europe from the period of Roman decadence to Dante. Mr. Henry C. Lea has dealt with several phases of the relation of the mediæval church to intellectual progress. Prof. George L. Burr has devoted his life to an investigation of the history of toleration, the results of which he has forecast in a number of precious articles and monographs. Prof. William A. Dunning has presented the first complete survey of the history of political theory since the publication of the classic work of Janet. Professors W. C. Abbott and W. R. Shepherd have devoted themselves to an investigation of the reaction of the commercial revolution on European thought and culture. McGiffert has sketched the history of

modern religious thought in a brilliant fashion. Finally, Prof. James Harvey Robinson has not only aroused an ardent interest in intellectual history on the part of the large number of enthusiastic students who have attended his stimulating lectures at Columbia University, but is now engaged on what promises to be the first complete summary of the transformations in the intellectual reactions of humanity. In this same field of intellectual history probably belong the valuable researches into the history of natural science in its relation to the progress of civilization which have been carried on by Karl Pearson, Shipley and Whetham in England; Du Bois-Reymond, Mach, Ostwald and Dannemann in Germany; Sarton in Belgium; Tannery and Duhem in France; and Sedgwick, Tyler, Libby, and L. Thorndike in America. Here also belong the contributions to the field of the history of aesthetics which has been cultivated by Symonds, Ruskin, Mahaffy and Murray in England; by Winckelmann, Burckhardt, Gervinus, Gregorovius, Wolftmann and Lübeck in Germany; by Renan, Sainte-Beuve, Taine and Reinach in France; and by Charles Eliot Norton and Ralph Adams Cram in America. Nor should one forget the many stimulating contributions of such writers as James, Royce, Dewey, Hall and Santayana, in the effort to make the more original and helpful trends in philosophy and psychology the common property of the intellectual classes.

The discussion of the extraordinary development of intellectual history in the last half century furnishes the logical transition from a discussion of those recent trends in historiography which have grown primarily out of the industrial revolution to those which have been a product of the remarkable progress in natural science in the last hundred years. As the industrial revolution was the great event in the economic and social history of the 19th century, so the discovery of the Darwinian theory of evolution was the central fact in the development of natural science in this period. While, as Professor Osborn and others have shown, the idea of evolution is an old one which originated in a certain crude and formal sense, at least, with the same Ionic Greeks that began the writing of prose and of history, its true significance as a fact in science and philosophy began with the publication of Darwin's 'Origin of the Species' in 1859. With the subsequent controversies over the details of the doctrine of natural selection one is not here concerned. Its reaction upon the outlook of the alert and progressive historical student was profound. Spencer worked over the whole field of social science from the evolutionary standpoint and gave it a genetic trend and meaning from which it could never escape. Enterprising biologists and sociologists like Schallmayer and Ammon in Germany, Lapouge in France, Galton in England and Keller in America have attempted to work out a science of social evolution conceived in terms of biological evolution carried over into the social field. Others, among them several distinguished historians, have essayed histories of religion and ethics based upon the new evolutionary conceptions and criteria. In this field the work of Spencer, Lecky, Leslie Stephen, Kidd, Hobhouse, Fiske and Sutherland has been most notable. Finally, an attempt to put the history of law and politics

upon an evolutionary basis was initiated in the suggestive writings of the "organic" school of sociologists and political scientists and of Maine, Bagehot and Ritchie. On the whole, however, the outstanding reaction of the new evolutionary conceptions upon historiography did not consist so much in the various special phases of their application to historical problems which have been mentioned above as in fixing upon the historian's mind the perception of the genetic nature of the social process and in giving him a firm basis upon which to develop a sound theory of progress.

With the general acceptance of the evolutionary hypothesis as to the origin and development of the human race it was inevitable that much greater attention would be given to the influence of the physical environment upon historical development. The general notion of the effect of physical environment upon human types and their behavior was an exceedingly old one which had originated with Hippocrates and had been passed on through the ages by Aristotle, Strabo, Vitruvius, Aquinas, Ibn Khaldun, Bodin and Montesquieu. While their general observations had some rough similarity to the conclusions of modern students, their explanations of environmental causation were most crude, being based primarily upon the doctrine of the alleged planetary influences upon the physiological processes of the human body. The foundations of a scientific study of the relation between geography and history were laid by the monumental studies of Karl Ritter in the first half of the 19th century, which were interpreted to the public in a more popular form by Guyot. Ritter found a worthy successor in Friedrich Ratzel whose profound and voluminous works are conventionally held to have founded the science of anthropogeography. His researches were rivalled in France by those of Élisée Reclus and were interpreted to the English and American world by his pupil, Miss Ellen Semple. In addition to the systematic works of Ratzel and Reclus, many suggestive contributions have been made to special phases of the influence of geography upon history. Metchnikoff has pointed out the significance of the great river systems of the world in the development of the chief historic civilizations. Demolins has dwelt in detail upon the great importance for history of the configuration of the land which has determined the routes which the peoples have travelled in their various dispersals from original seats of culture. Especially noteworthy has been the suggestive, if not entirely convincing, work of Professor Huntington, whose investigations in Asia Minor have enabled him to ascertain the existence of considerable climatic oscillations in the past which throw new light on the hitherto unexplained problems of the shifting of the centres of civilization from Egypt to north-western Europe and of the invasions of Europe by successive waves of Asiatic peoples. The net result of this work of students of anthropogeography has been to compel every self-respecting historian to acquire some knowledge of the geographical setting of a nation before attempting to narrate its history. Historians have not been slow to appreciate the value of these significant studies upon the relation of geography to the development of civilization. Professor George has produced a stimulating

attempt to indicate the general dependence of history, particularly in its military aspects, upon geographical conditions. Professor Myres has sketched in a brilliant fashion the geographic background of the rise of the earliest seats of civilization. The significance of geographical elements in the history of antiquity has been abundantly recognized by Professors Hogarth, Olmstead and Breasted. Ernst Curtius, a disciple of Ritter, for the first time made clear the geographical basis of the history of Greece. Freeman described in great detail the topography of Sicily. Nissen has shown with admirable thoroughness the effect of Italy's topography and situation upon its historical development. The importance of local geographical conditions for the development of national history was made apparent in the case of France by Michelet; with regard to England by Green; for Germany by Riehl; and with respect to the settlement and history of North America by Payne, Shaler, Semple, Hulbert, Brigham and Turner. Finally, Buckle and Hellwald have, with less success, attempted general surveys based upon the conception of the interdependence of nature and the human mind, while Helmholtz has presided over the production of the first extensive co-operative history which has made a consistent attempt to emphasize the anthropological and geographical factors in historical development according to the general doctrines of Ratzel. The above bald enumeration of the chief phases of progress in modern anthropo-geography and its contributions to historical interpretation, perhaps, calls for some critical reservations. In no field has there been greater exaggeration of a single set of "causes," or a more persistent flouting of the rules of critical methodology. Particularly have the adherents of this type of interpretation failed to distinguish between a "conditioning" and a "determining" influence. Finally, it is a generally accepted doctrine among all critical students of cultural evolution that environmental influences decrease in importance in proportion as the progress of science and civilization enables man to subdue nature to his own purposes. For these valuable criticisms of too enthusiastic an acceptance of the geographical interpretation students are more indebted to the analytical anthropologists, such as Boas, Wissler, Lowie and Goldenweiser, than to the criticism of historians.

Even more direct and vital in its influence upon historiography was the new science of anthropology, which, in its modern form, was a product of the new evolutionary concepts applied to the study of mankind as a unity. While not ignoring the contributions of earlier students, modern anthropology owed its origin primarily to the researches and writings of Tylor in England, Bastian in Germany and Boas in America. Its purpose, according to Professor Boas, is "to reconstruct the early history of mankind, and, wherever possible, to express, in the form of laws ever-recurring modes of historical happenings." The chief point of contact between anthropology and history is found in the attempt of the former to discover and formulate the laws of cultural evolution. With the controversies between the older school of unilateral evolutionists, represented by Spencer, Avebury, Morgan and Frazer, the more recent advocates of the doc-

trine of "diffusion," such as F. Graebner, Rivers and Elliott Smith, and the exponents of the so-called theory of "convergent development" of cultural similarities and repetitions, among the most important of whom are Ehrenreich, Boas, Lowie and Goldenweiser, it will be impossible to deal in this place. It will be sufficient to insist upon the fact that no historian can regard himself as competent to attempt any large synthesis of historical material without having thoroughly acquainted himself with these fundamental attempts to bring definite laws of development out of the chaos of historical facts. An attempt to link up cultural anthropology with a dynamic history has recently been made in two thoughtful books by Professor Teggart of the University of California. Dr. Goldenweiser in a recent brilliant article has endeavored to provide a systematic methodological point of departure for scientific history and critical anthropology. Several other significant influences of anthropology in altering the attitude of the historian should be noted. In the first place, nothing could be more destructive of chauvinism or more important for acquiring a proper perspective for the interpretation of historical development than a perusal of the comparative surveys of legal, political, social and religious institutions by such writers as Lippert, Ihering, Tylor, Westermarck, Hobhouse, Durkheim and Sumner. The greatest blow to the venerable myth of the origins of political democracy in the Germanic folk-moot, which it ever sustained, was the discovery that it could be matched among primitive peoples the world over and that it was not the sole possession of the "noblest branch of the Aryans." Again, while the laws of cultural development which have been formulated by anthropology and the breadth or view inseparable from the handling of anthropological data are of the utmost value to all fields of history, anthropology has a particularly close relation to the field of ancient history in that the beginnings of civilization cannot be properly understood and interpreted without a thorough acquaintance with the background of the primitive culture which preceded the dawn of written history. Finally, anthropology, by its study of mankind as a unity in time and space and especially through its basic premise developed by Bastian of the fundamental unity of the human mind, has for the first time provided a firm basis for a rational conception of the real unity of history.

Closely related to the subject of anthropology, and by some considered a branch of that science, is the relatively recent science of prehistoric and proto-historic archeology. Working in co-operation with geologists and students of paleontology and comparative anatomy the archeologists, such as Boucher de Perthes, Rutot, Breuil, Boule, Déchelette, Cartailhac, Schmidt, Obermaier, Peet and Munro, have revealed the existence of mankind on the earth during a space of time almost beyond the range of human conception. The origins of the race have been pushed back from the few thousand years comprehended in the exact chronologies of Eusebius, Jerome, Usher and Lightfoot to a vague and uncertain period not less than a quarter of a million years ago. The profound modification in the historical perspective which this epoch-making discovery has necessitated

is obvious. As Professor Robinson has pointed out, Thales and Herodotus can no longer be regarded as among the "ancients," but in the new scale of time must be viewed as our contemporaries. Not only has the discovery of the remoteness of human origins fundamentally altered all previous conceptions of the time element in history, but it has given a new impulse to a dynamic theory of progress, in that it has shown that mankind have advanced further in the few centuries that have elapsed since the dawn of written history than they had in the tens of thousands of years previous to that time, and also because it has demonstrated that the rate of progress seems to be accelerated almost beyond comparison as one approaches extremely recent times. Not only have the archaeologists rendered almost revolutionary services to history in lengthening the historical perspective, but they have also been of the utmost assistance in increasing the historian's knowledge of "lost civilizations" within what are conventionally regarded as "historic" times. Winckler and Garstang have rediscovered the lost Hittite civilization of ancient Syria. Schliemann, Evans and Dörpfeld, among others, have revealed a flourishing Aegean civilization coeval with the civilization of Egypt in the "Pyramid Age" of the third millennium B.C. The progenitors of the historic Greeks no longer appear as the builders of civilization but as barbarous destroyers who ruined a civilization which they were unable to match for five centuries. Equally significant, though less familiar, are the researches of Déchelette, Julian, Rice Holmes and others in the history and culture of ancient Gaul, which have exhibited an early north European civilization which was in touch with the Aegean civilization at its height and have thrown into high relief the relative savagery and backwardness of Teutonic culture as it appeared in western Europe at the beginning of the Christian era. No adequate history of Europe can any longer ignore the vital importance of this ancient Celtic culture. In this same department should be placed the epoch-making discoveries in philology and archaeology which have allowed scholars to arrive at an accurate and comprehensive knowledge of the civilizations of the ancient East, which had been hitherto known only by allusions in the literature of the Hebrews, Greeks and Romans. About 1825 Champollion deciphered the Rosetta stone, mastered hieroglyphics and laid the foundations of Egyptology. Egyptian chronology and philology were firmly established by Lepsius and Brugsch. Mariette, Maspero and Petrie have led in the excavations that have produced Egyptian archaeology. Meyer has revised Egyptian chronology and Basted has produced the best synthesis of the history of Egyptian civilization. Erman has provided the only detailed study of the social history of Egypt. What Champollion achieved for Egyptology was accomplished for the history of Babylonia and Assyria by Henry Rawlinson through his reading of the Behistun inscription in the middle of the 19th century. Schrader, Delitzsch and Lagarde perfected Assyriology and Semitic philology; Botta, Layard, Sarzec, Hilprecht and Winckler have supervised the all-important excavations of this region; and Maspero, Meyer, Rogers, Goodspeed and King have pro-

vided the most reliable narratives of Assyrian and Babylonian history, while Jastrow has drawn the best picture of the culture of these ancient nations.

Another most important development in historiography in the last century has been the gradual but sure secularization of "sacred" history, and the consequent removal of the last obstacle to the scholarly and objective treatment of every field of history. This progress has been in part a product of the brilliant advances in the critical methods in the last century, and in part has been due to the philosophical destruction of the whole basis of the conception of "sacred" history, which has resulted from the unparalleled discoveries in natural science since 1800. On the whole, it is probable that the latter has been the most important influence because the difference in the skill in handling documents on the part of Mabillon and Wellhausen was infinitely less than the divergence between their "Weltanschauung." The process through which the sources of the Old Testament were discovered and separated has been briefly discussed in an earlier section of this article and need not be repeated here. Upon the basis of this criticism of the sources there has grown up a critical history of the Jewish nation and its religion which had been impossible of attainment since the inclusion of Hebrew history as the corner-stone of the Christian synthesis of the history of antiquity by Eusebius, Jerome and Orosius. A rather lame and halting beginning of a critical and objective history of the Hebrews, upon the basis of the biblical criticism of the early 19th century, was made by the Göttingen professor, Heinrich Ewald, whose "History of the People of Israel" was published in the years following 1843. The first straightforward and thorough-going critical history of the religious development of the Jews was contained in the "Religion of Israel," published by the Leyden professor, Abraham Kuennen, in 1869. Even more advanced was the epoch-making "History of Israel" of Julius Wellhausen, a professor in Göttingen and the greatest of Old Testament scholars. Wellhausen's work, published originally in 1878, was but a brilliant fragment, and the preparation of a systematic history of Israel in accordance with the advanced views of Wellhausen was the work of the Giessen professor, Bernhard Stade, whose "History of the People of Israel" was published in 1887. The results of these works from the new critical mode of approach were utterly to destroy the exaggerations regarding the glories of ancient Israel, which had been set forth in Kings and Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah, had been repeated by Josephus, and were thoroughly embodied in Christian tradition. For the first time the history of Palestine was revealed in its proper perspective in the larger history of the ancient East. Not less damaging was the effect of the work of Wellhausen and his associates upon the doctrine of a unique, primordial and revealed monotheism among the Jews. It was clearly shown that monotheism had been a gradual and precarious development out of an original polytheism, and that its maintenance was always difficult and subject to serious lapses. The late origin of the alleged laws of Moses was no less clearly established. The secularizing process was carried

still further by the brilliant Cambridge professor, Robertson Smith, in his 'Religion of the Semites,' which showed the many points of similarity between the religion of the Hebrews and the religious beliefs and practices of the other branches of the Semitic peoples. Finally, Delitzsch, Winckler and Rogers have made clear the profound influence of the Babylonian historical and religious traditions upon the religion of Israel. While the work of the most of these writers was highly technical and intended primarily for scholars, its general significance was popularized through Renan's brilliant and widely-read 'History of the People of Israel.' No less startling has been the result of the invasion of the "sacred" history of the Christian era by the critical methods. Building on the basis of the textual criticism of the sources of the New Testament by such scholars as Strauss, Baur, Loisy and Harnack, and the study of contemporary religions by Renan, Hatch, Cumont, Glover, Dill and others, Percy Gardner, Weizsäcker, Conybeare, Wernle, Harnack, Duchesne and McGiffert have explained with great scholarship and lucidity the syncretic nature of Apostolic and Patristic Christianity, the historic causes for the final success of Christianity, and the nature of the gradual development of Christian dogma and ecclesiastical organization. Henry C. Lea, in a series of massive monographs, which constitute the most notable contribution of America to Church history, has dealt with the most diverse phases of the history of the mediaeval Church in a fine objective and secular spirit. Beard and Trötsch have traced the rise and development of Protestantism with insight and candor. Three Catholic scholars of the highest rank in the field of scholarship, Döllinger, Huber, and Reusch, have made as great contributions to the battle against ecclesiastical obscurantism as any historians from the Protestant or sceptical camps. Döllinger totally demolished the alleged historical foundations of ultra-montanism and infallibility in his work on 'The Pope and the Council.' Huber surveyed the history of the Jesuits with the aim of proving their deadly opposition to the spirit of modern learning and the freedom of thought. Reusch contributed the standard treatise on the history of the Papal Index and threw a flood of light upon the sinister machinery through which the reactionary element in Catholicism has endeavored to perpetuate the credulity of its followers and to exclude the perilous fruits of modern scientific and critical research. The net result of the labors of critical scholars of every religious complexion in the field of "sacred history" has been to destroy entirely the premises of the "Fathers," which led them to mark off a field of historical development which was taboo to critical research, and it has opened every field to the operation of the same degree of patient research and calm and objective narration.

With the growth of modern natural science and the critical attitude in the appropriation and assimilation of knowledge, the effort to formulate some magnificent and systematic philosophical scheme for the organization and presentation of historical development, such as was devised by Augustine and Hegel, has greatly declined. Scepticism of any formal philosophy of history seems to be but a necessary accompaniment of our increasing knowledge of the

infinite complexity of social and historical phenomena, as these attempts to reduce history to such simplicity savor too much of the *a priori* method, now so thoroughly discredited. To take the place of the older dogmatic philosophy of history there have developed what may be called various "interpretations" of historical data. These at present differ from the older philosophy of history in the absence of any teleological element and in the rejection of the deductive method. They aim solely to emphasize and bring into high relief those factors, which, according to the various schools, seem to have been most influential in producing the civilization of to-day. It is, in short, the attempt to supplement Ranke's aimless search for what occurred in the past by at least a feeble and humble effort to explain how the present order came about. Far from being less scientific than the older program of Ranke, it really constitutes the perfect completion of scientific method in historiography, in the same way that the formulation of the great laws of natural science constitute the logical completion of the task of gathering data by observation and experimentation in the laboratory. The preceding sketch of the development of historiography affords striking corroboration of the thesis of Professor Shotwell that the prevailing types of historical interpretation through the ages faithfully reflect the dominating intellectual interests of the successive eras. The divine epics of the ancient Orient were superseded by the mythological and philosophical interpretations of the thinkers of classical antiquity. With the general acceptance of Christianity, the classical mythology was replaced by that eschatological conception which dominated historical interpretation from Augustine to Bossuet. With the coming of the commercial revolution and its violent shock to the old intellectual order, there arose the critical and rationalistic school of Bacon, Descartes, Voltaire and Hume, which, on account of its being too far in advance of the intellectual orientation of the masses, tended to lapse into the idealism of Kant and Fichte and the romanticism of Burke, Bonald, DeMaistre and Hegel. The growth of nationalism following the French Revolution tended to give temporary precedence to the political mode of interpretation, but the great transformations which constituted the industrial revolution, of necessity doomed so superficial a view to an ephemeral existence. The unprecedented breadth and depth of modern knowledge and intellectual interests have produced a number of interpretations of historical development, most of which represent the outgrowth of some one of those outstanding intellectual and social transformations which were reviewed above. There are at present some eight definite schools of historical interpretation among the representatives of the modernized students of historical phenomena, each of which has made an important contribution to our knowledge of historical development. They are in no sense in all cases mutually exclusive, but are rather, to a large degree, supplementary. They may be designated as the personal or "great man" theory; the economic or materialistic; the allied geographical or environmental; the spiritual or idealistic; the scientific; the anthropological; the sociological; and the synthetic or

"collective psychological." It may be pointed out in passing that, in the main, the older type of historian either clings to the outworn theory of political causation, or, with Professor Emer-
ton, holds that historical development is entirely arbitrary and obeys no ascertainable laws. The best known of these schools of historical interpretation, and the only one that the current political historians accord any consideration, is that which found its most noted representatives in Carlyle and Froude, who claimed that the great personalities of history were the main causative factors in historical development. This view is, of course, closely allied to the catastrophic interpretation of the 18th century rationalists. Perhaps its most distinguished adherents to-day are Prof. Émile Faguet of Paris and Prof. William A. Dunning of Columbia University. The contributions of the economic school of historical interpretation, which was founded by Feurbach and Marx, and has been carried on by a host of later and less dogmatic writers, such as Sumner, Schmoller, Loria Simons, Ashley, Beard, Bogart and Simkovich, are too familiar to call for any additional elaboration. In its best and most generally accepted form, it contends that the prevailing mode and status of the economic processes in society will to a very great degree decide the nature of existing social institutions. In spite of slight exaggerations, no phase of historical interpretation has been more fruitful or epoch-making. Immediately related is the geographical interpretation of history which began with Hippocrates and continued through the writings of Strabo, Vitruvius, Bodin, Montesquieu and Buckle, has been revived and given a more scientific interpretation in the hands of such writers as Karl Ritter, Ratzel, Reclus, Semple, Metchnikoff, Demolins and Huntington. Since the days of Ritter no respectable historian has dared to chronicle the history of a nation without first having acquired a knowledge of its geography. The special phases of this interpretation have been sketched above and need not be repeated at this point. Widely at variance with the economic and geographical interpretation is the somewhat belated offshoot of the idealism of Fichte and Hegel, to be found in the so-called spiritual interpretation of history, which finds its most ardent advocates in Prof. Rudolph Eucken of Germany and Prof. Shailer Matthews of Chicago. Professor Matthews thus defines this view of history: "The spiritual interpretation of history must be found in the discovery of spiritual forces co-operating with geographic and economic to produce a general tendency toward conditions which are truly personal. And these conditions will not be found in generalizations concerning metaphysical entities, but in the activities of worthy men finding self-expression in social relations for the ever more complete subjection of physical nature to human welfare." Viewed in this sense, this type of interpretation can be said to have a considerable affinity with the "great man" theory and apparently aims to reconcile this doctrine with the critical and synthetic interpretation, under cover of a common theological orientation. Closely conformable to this mode of interpretation is Prof. E. D. Adams' attempt to connect the historical development of the United

States with a succession of great national ideals, the origins of which are not explained. The attempt to view human progress as directly correlated with the advances in natural science received its first great exposition in the writings of Condorcet and was revived by Comte and Buckle. Aside from the attention given to it by students of the history of science, such as Sarton, Tannery, Libby and Sedgwick, this phase of historical interpretation has been sadly neglected by recent historians, though Prof. F. S. Marvin and Prof. Lynn Thorndike have recently shown its promising potentialities. It has been emphasized incidentally by Professors Lamprecht, Shotwell and Robinson in their synthetic interpretation of history, but it remains the least exploited, and yet, perhaps, the most promising of all the special phases of historical interpretation. Its adherents claim a more fundamental causal importance than can be assigned to the economic interpretation, in that they contend that the prevailing state of scientific knowledge and application will determine the existing modes of economic life and activities. The main tenets of the anthropological interpretation, as well as an enumeration of its chief adherents, have been provided above and may be passed over at this point. The closely related sociological interpretation of history goes back as far as the Arab, Ibn Khaldun; was developed by Vico, Turgot, Ferguson, Condorcet, Comte and Spencer; and has its ablest modern representatives in Professor Giddings of Columbia, Professor Thomas of Chicago and Professor Hobhouse of London. Professor Giddings admirably describes this theory as "an attempt to account for the origin, structure and activities of society by the operation of physical, vital and psychical causes, working together in a process of evolution." As a genetic social science, it works hand in hand with cultural anthropology in the effort to explain the repetitions and uniformities in historical development and to formulate the laws of historical causation. But the latest, most inclusive and most important of all types of historical interpretation, and the one which, perhaps, most perfectly represents the newer history, is the synthetic or "collective psychological." According to this type of historical interpretation no single category of "causes" is sufficient to explain all phases and periods of historical development. Nothing less than the collective psychology of any period can be deemed adequate to determine the historical development of that age, and it is the task of the historian to discover, evaluate and set forth the chief factors which create and shape the collective view of life and determine the nature of the group struggle for existence and improvement. The most eminent leaders of this school of historical interpretation have been Professor Lamprecht of Leipzig; Professors Lévy-Bruhl, Fouillée, Seignobos and Durkheim of Paris; Professor Marvin of London; Professors Robinson and Shotwell of Columbia University, and Professor Veblen of New York. Their general doctrine has gained particular acceptance in France, probably on account of the early and extensive development of social psychology in that country.

Even this brief and hasty review of a few of the more conspicuous innovations in the de-

velopment of historiography in the last century will convince the reader that the progress in this field has not been less than in the other branches of human knowledge. It will serve to convey the full significance of Frederic Garrison's statement that Freeman's conception of history as exclusively "past politics" ignored nine-tenths of human history. A synthesis of the various modes of approach to the subject-matter of history must be the ideal of all future historians, but the difficulties inherent in this endeavor will make it hard to be attained. An attempt at a synthetic review of the development of civilization has been essayed by Professor Seignobos. A less complete, but a more stimulating and suggestive outline has been supplied by Professor Marvin. An able and original, if not wholly objective, synthesis of the history of the modern world has been supplied by the detailed manual of Professor Hayes. Prof. W. C. Abbott's recent attempt to indicate the significance of the commercial revolution for the development of modern civilization is probably the best harbinger which has appeared of that synthetic tendency which must characterize the "new history." Professors Robinson and Shotwell have long urged and predicted a larger synthesis of historical material. Whatever success daring individual scholars may achieve in this synthetic movement, it will be apparent that the history of the future must be more and more a co-operative work. The complete mastery of all the newer points of attack will be denied to most individuals and each must contribute through his own speciality. The understanding of this vital fact has contributed more than anything else to a growing spirit of mutual toleration and appreciation among the various "schools" of historians. In much the same way that the truth has been replaced by truth in recent years, so the history of various enthusiasts has been supplanted by a broader and sounder history. Again, in view of the fact that it has now become apparent that the progress of the human race in a cultural sense since 1500 has been greater than the advancement in 50 or more preceding centuries, the supreme importance of modern history has come to be generally recognized, and the primary attention of the previous generation to mediæval history has become a thing of the past. The earnest labors of the mediævalists cannot be deplored for they have furnished the younger generation of historical scholars with not only a sound methodology, but also with the indispensable background for interpreting the origins of the modern age. Out of the labors of the last half century has come a "new history" which will not only furnish a mental discipline for training in the methods of exact scholarship, but will also enable one to know the past and interpret its significance. As Professor Robinson has said: "The 'New History' is escaping from the limitations formerly imposed upon a study of the past. It will come in time consciously to meet our daily needs; it will avail itself of all those discoveries that are being made about mankind by anthropologists; economists, psychologists and sociologists—discoveries which during the last 50 years have served to revolutionize our ideas of the origin, progress and prospects of our race. . . . History must not be regarded as a stationary subject

which can only progress by refining its methods, and accumulating, criticizing, and assimilating new material, but it is bound to alter its ideals and aims with the general progress of society and the social sciences, and it will ultimately play an infinitely more important role in our intellectual life than it has hitherto done."

Bibliography.—I. THE NATURE OF HISTORY.—Adams, E. D., 'The Power of Ideals in American History'; Adams, G. E., 'History and the Philosophy of History' (in *The American Historical Review*, 1909); Adams, H. B., 'Methods of Historical Study'; Barth, P., 'Die Philosophie der Geschichte als Soziologie'; Beard, C. A., 'An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution of the United States' (Chap. I); Bernheim, E., 'Lehrbuch der historischen Methode' (Chap. I); Berr, H., 'La Synthèse en Histoire'; Bourne, H. E., 'The Teaching of History'; Bristol, L. M., 'Social Adaptation' (Chaps. III, VI, VIII, IX); Buckle, H. T., 'History of Civilization in England' (Chap. I); Burr, G. L., 'Freedom in History' (in *The American Historical Review*, 1917); Bury, J. B., 'The Science of History' (Inaugural Lecture as Regius Professor of Modern History at Cambridge); Carlyle, T., 'Essay on History'; Comte, A., 'The Principles of A Positive Polity' (Vol. III); Croce, B., 'Intorno alla Storia della Storiografia'; 'Il Concetto della Storia'; Dalberg-Acton, J. E. D., 'Inaugural Lecture as Regius Professor of Modern History at Cambridge'; Dilthey, W., 'Einleitung in die Geisteswissenschaften'; Droysen, J. G., 'Précis of the Science of History'; Dunning, W. A., 'Truth in History' (in *The American Historical Review*, 1914); Eucken, R., 'Die Einheit des Geistelbens'; Flint, R., 'The History of the Philosophy of History' (2 vols.); Freeman, E. A., 'The Methods of Historical Study'; George, H. B., 'Historical Evidence'; Giddings, F. H., 'Principles of Sociology' (Book I); 'A Theory of Social Causation'; Goldenweiser, A. A., 'History, Psychology and Culture' (in *Journal of Philosophy, Psychology and Scientific Methods*, 1918); Green, J. R., 'A Short History of the English People' (Preface); Harrison, F., 'The Meaning of History'; Haskins and Bourne, 'History' (in *Cyclopædia of Education*); Lamprecht, K., 'What is History?'; Langlois and Seignobos, 'An Introduction to the Study of History'; Lowie, R. H., 'Culture and Ethnology'; Macaulay, T. B., 'Essay on History'; Matthews, S., 'A Spiritual Interpretation of History'; Meister, A., 'Grundriss der Geschichtswissenschaft'; Monod, G., 'Portraits et Souvenirs'; 'La Méthode en Histoire' (in *La Revue Bleue*, 1908); Ranke, L., 'Zur Kritik neuerer Geschichtsschreiber'; Ratzel and Semple, 'The Influence of Geographical Environment'; Rhodes, J. F., 'Historical Essays'; Ritter, K., 'Geographical Essays'; Robinson, J. H., 'Readings in European History' (Vol. I, Chap. I); 'The New History'; Seligman, E. R. A., 'The Economic Interpretation of History'; Shotwell, J. T., 'The Interpretation of History' (in *The American Historical Review*, 1913); 'History' (Eleventh edition of *Encyclopædia Britannica*); Simmel, G., 'Die Probleme der Geschichtsphilosophie'; Small, A. W., 'The Meaning of Social Science'; Spencer, H., 'What Knowledge is of Most Worth' (in *West-*

minister Review, 1859); Taine, H., 'History of English Literature' (Introduction); Tarde, G., 'The Laws of Imitation' (Chap. IV); Teggart, F. J., 'Prolegomena to History'; 'The Process of History'; Thorndike, L., 'History of Mediæval Europe'; (Chap. I): 'The Scientific Presentation of History' (in *Popular Science Monthly*, 1910); Todd, A. J., 'Theories of Social Progress' (Part III); Trevelyan, G. M., 'Clio, A Muse'; Troeltsch, E., 'Historiography' (in *Hastings' Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*); Vincent, J. H., 'Historical Research'; Wolf, G., 'Einführung in das Studium der neueren Geschichte'; Woodbridge, F. J. E., 'The Purpose of History.'

II. THE "THRESHOLD OF HISTORY."—Arthur, J., 'Time and its Measurement'; Breasted, J. H., 'Ancient Times' (Chaps. I-II); 'The Development of Religion and Thought in Ancient Egypt'; Déchelette, J., 'Manuel d'Archéologie préhistorique'; Dussaud, R., 'Les Civilisations préhelleniques'; Fowler and Wheeler, 'Greek Archeology'; Haddon, A. C., 'A History of Anthropology' (especially Chap. VIII); Hall, H. R., 'Ancient History of the Near East' (Chap. I, Section 6); Hawes, H. B., 'Crete, the Forerunner of Greece'; Lubbock, J., 'Prehistoric Times'; Macdonald, J. C., 'Chronologies and Calendars'; Maret, R. R., 'Anthropology' (Chap. V); Marti, K., 'Chronology' (in *Encyclopædia Biblica*); Meyer, E., 'Ägyptische Chronologie'; Morgan, J. de, 'Les premières civilisations'; Mortillet, G. de, 'La Préhistoire'; 'La Classification ethnologique'; Munro, R., 'Palæolithic Man and Terremare Settlements in Europe'; 'The Lake Dwellings of Europe'; Osborn, H. F., 'Men of the Old Stone Age'; Peet, T. E., 'The Stone and Bronze Ages in Italy'; 'Rough Stone Monuments and their Builders'; Robinson, J. H., 'The New History' (Chap. III); Sedgwick and Tyler, 'A Short History of Science' (Chaps. I-VI); Shotwell, J. T., 'The Discovery of Time' (in *Journal of Psychology, Philosophy and Scientific Methods*, 1915); Sollas, W. J., 'Ancient Hunters and their Modern Representatives'; Tyler, E. B., 'Anthropology' (Chaps. IV, V, VII, XIII, XV); Webster, H., 'Rest Days' (especially Chap. VI); 'Ancient History' (Chap. I); White, A. D., 'A History of the Warfare of Science with Theology' (Vol. I, Chaps. I, V-X).

III. HISTORIOGRAPHY IN ORIENTAL ANTIQUITY.—Bacon, B. W., 'The Genesis of Genesis'; Breasted, J. H., 'Ancient Records of Egypt' (Introduction); Charles, R. H., 'Between the Old and New Testaments'; 'Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha'; Cheyne, T. K., 'The Founders of Old Testament Criticism'; Cory, I. F., 'Ancient Fragments'; Duff, A., 'History of Old Testament Criticism'; Hall, H. R., 'The Ancient History of the Near East' (Chap. I); Harper, R. F., (ed.) 'Assyrian and Babylonian Literature'; Jacobs, J., 'Historiography' (in *Jewish Encyclopædia*); Johns, C. W. H., 'Ancient Babylon' (Chap. I); 'Ancient Assyria' (Chaps. I-II); Kent, C. F., 'The Students' Old Testament logically and chronologically Arranged'; King, L. W., 'Chronicles Concerning the Early Babylonian Kings'; Moore, G. F., 'The Literature of the Old Testament'; Rogers, R. W., 'History of Babylonia and Assyria' (Vol. I, especially Chap. X); 'Cuneiform Parallels to the Old Testament'; Sayce, A. H., and others

(ed.), 'Records of the Past'; Torrey, C. C., 'The Composition and Historical Value of Ezra-Nehemiah'; Wellhausen, J., 'The History of Israel'; 'Die Composition des Hexateuchs.'

IV. HISTORIOGRAPHY AMONG THE GREEKS AND ROMANS.—Boissier, G., 'Tacitus'; Botsford, G. W., 'A Source Book of Ancient History' (Chaps. VI, XXVIII); Botsford and Sihler, 'Hellenic Civilization'; Bury, J. B., 'The Ancient Greek Historians'; Cauer, F., 'Thukydides und Seine Vorgänger' (in *Historische Zeitschrift*, 1899); Christ, W., 'Geschichte der griechischen Literatur'; Cornford, F. M., 'Thucydides Mythistoricus'; Croiset, A., 'Histoire de la Littérature Grecque'; Cruttwell, 'History of Roman Literature'; Cuntz, O., 'Polybius und sein Werk'; Drerup, E., 'Die historische Kunst der Griechen'; Duff, J. W., 'A Literary History of Rome'; Gomperz, T., 'Greek Thinkers'; Grundy, G. B., 'Thucydides and the History of his Age'; Holmes, T. R., 'Julius Caesar's Conquest of Gaul'; Kornemann, E., 'Thukydides und die römische Historiographie'; 'Kaiser Hadrian und der letzte grosse Historiker von Rom'; Mackail, J. W., 'Latin Literature'; Mahaffy, J. P., 'History of Classical Greek Literature'; Murray, G., 'A History of Ancient Greek Literature'; Myres, J. L., (ed.), 'Anthropology and the Classics' (Chap. V); Peter, H., 'Wahrheit und Kunst, Geschichtsschreibung und Plagiat im Klassischen Altertum'; 'Die geschichtliche Literatur über die römische Kaiserzeit bis Theodosius I und ihre Quellen'; Susemihl, F., 'Geschichte der griechischen Literatur in der Alexandrinerzeit'; Teuffel and Schwabe, 'History of Roman Literature'; Wachsmuth, C., 'Über Ziele und Methoden der griechischen Geschichtsschreibung.'

V. THE HISTORICAL WRITINGS OF THE APOSTOLIC AND PATRISTIC PERIODS.—Ayer, J. C., 'Source Book for Ancient Church History'; Bacon, B. W., 'The Making of the New Testament'; Bardenhewer, O., 'Patrology'; 'Geschichte der altkirchlichen Litteratur'; Bury, J. B., 'The History of the Freedom of Thought' (Chap. III); Church, R. W., 'Cassiodorus'; Conybeare, F. C., 'Myth, Magic and Morals'; 'History of New Testament Criticism'; Duchesne, L., 'The Early History of the Christian Church'; Ebert, A., 'Histoire générale de la littérature du moyen âge' (Vol. I); Flick, A. C., 'The Rise of the Mediæval Church'; Gibbon, E., 'The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire' (Chaps. XV-XVI); Gwatkin, H. M., 'Selections from the Early Christian Writers'; Harnack, A., 'A History of Dogma'; 'Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur'; Kirch, J. P., 'History' (in *Catholic Encyclopædia*); Krüger, G., 'History of Early Christian Literature'; Loisy, A., 'Les Évangélistes synoptiques'; McGiffert, A. C., 'The Church History of Eusebius'; 'History of the Apostolic Age'; Muzey, D. S., 'The Rise of the New Testament'; Nash, H. S., 'The History of the Higher Criticism of the New Testament'; Ogden, C. J., 'Orosius' Seven Books of History Against the Pagans'; Renan, E., 'History of the Origins of Christianity'; Santayana, G., 'Reason in Religion' (Chap. VI); Schaff and Wace, (eds.), 'The Ante-Nicene, Nicene, and Post-Nicene Fathers'; 'A Dictionary of Christian Biography'; Stanton, V. H., 'The Gospels as Historical Documents'; Taylor, H. O., 'The Mediæval Mind' (Chaps.

III-V): Vincent, M. R., 'The History of the Textual Criticism of the New Testament'; Wrede, W., 'The Origin of the New Testament.'

VI. MEDIEVAL HISTORIOGRAPHY.—Balzani, U., 'Early Chroniclers of Europe: Italy'; Brehaut, E., 'The History of the Franks by Gregory, Bishop of Tours'; Büdinger, M., 'Die Universalhistorie im Mittelalter'; Constans, L., 'Les grands historiens du moyen âge'; Debidour and Etienne, 'Les chroniqueurs français au moyen âge'; Delisle, L., 'Littérature latine et histoire du moyen âge'; Ebert, A., 'Histoire générale de la littérature du moyen âge à l'Europe occidentale'; Foulke, W. D., 'A History of the Langobards by Paul the Deacon'; Gairdner, J., 'Early Chroniclers of Europe: England'; Giles, J. A., 'Matthew Paris' English History from the Year 1235 to 1273'; Gross, C., 'The Sources and Literature of English History'; Hashagen, J., 'Otto von Freising als Geschichtsphilosoph und Kirchenpolitiker'; Hayes, C. J. H., 'An Introduction to the Sources relating to the Germanic Invasions'; Jahncke, R., 'Guilelmus Neubrigensis'; Jones, W. L., 'Latin Chroniclers from the Eleventh to the Thirteenth Centuries' (in 'Cambridge History of English Literature' Vol. I, Chap. IX); Langlois, C. V., 'L'historiographie'; Lasch, B., 'Das Erwachen und die Entwicklung der historischen Kritik im Mittelalter'; Manitius, M., 'Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters'; Masson, G., 'Early Chroniclers of Europe: France'; Molinier, A., 'Les sources de l'histoire de France' (Vol. V, Introduction); Otto of Freising, 'Die Taten Friedrichs' (in *Die Geschichtsschreiber*); Pae-tow, L. J., 'A Guide to the Study of Mediaeval History'; Paris and Jeanroy, 'Extraits des chroniqueurs français'; Potthast, A., 'Wegweiser durch die Geschichtswerke des europäischen Mittelalters'; Ritter, M., 'Die Christlich-mittelalterliche Geschichtsschreibung' (in *Historische Zeitschrift*, 1911); Robinson, J. H., 'Readings in European History' (Chaps. I, IV, X-XII); Sandys, J. E., 'A History of Classical Scholarship' (Vol. I); Schulz, M., 'Die Lehre von der historischen Methode bei den Geschichtsschreibern des Mittelalters'; Stevenson, W. H., 'Six English Chronicles'; Taylor, H. O., 'The Mediaeval Mind' (Chaps. X-XIII, XXI, XXXI); Teuffel, R., 'Individuelle Persönlichkeitsdarstellung in dem Deutschen Geschichtswesen des 10 und 11 Jahrhunderts'; Wattenbach and Lenz, 'Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter.'

VII. HUMANISM AND HISTORIOGRAPHY.—Beck, F., 'Studien zu Leonardo Bruni'; Benoist, E., 'Guichardin'; Brandi, K., 'Das Werden des Renaissance'; Brown, P. H., 'George Buchanan, Humanist and Reformer'; Cirot, G., 'Mariana historien'; Clarke and Foxcroft, 'A Life of Gilbert Burnet' (Introduction by C. H. Firth); Emerton, E., 'The Beginnings of Modern Europe' (Chaps. IX-X); Firth, C. H., 'Clarendon's History' (in *English Historical Review*, 1904); Fueter, E., 'L'Histoire de l'Historiographie Moderne' (Books I-II); Gebhardt, E., 'Les historiens florentins de la Renaissance et les commencements de la économie politique et sociale'; Gervinus, G., 'Geschichte der florentinischen Historiographie'; Hulme, E. M., 'The Renaissance and the Reformation'; Joachimsen, P., 'Ge-

schichtsauffassung und Geschichtsschreibung in Deutschland unter dem Einfluss des Humanismus'; Loomis, L., 'Medieval Hellenism'; Masius, A., 'Flavius Blondus'; Mayer, E. W., 'Machiavellis Geschichtsauffassung'; Morley, J., 'Critical Miscellanies' (Vol. IV); Pattison, M., 'Essays'; Ranke, L., 'Zur Kritik neuerer Geschichtsschreiber'; Ritter, M., 'Studien zur Entwicklung der Geschichtswissenschaft' (in *Historische Zeitschrift*, 1912); Rödding, 'Pufendorf als Historiker und Politiker'; Sandys, J. E., 'A History of Classical Scholarship' (Vol. I); Schwahn, W., 'Lorenzo Valla: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Humanismus'; Villari, P., 'Niccolò Machiavelli'; Voigt, G., 'Die Wiederbelebung des klassischen Alterthums'; Walser, E., 'Poggio Florentinus, Leben und Werke'; Wegele, F. X., 'Geschichte der deutschen Historiographie'; Whitcomb, M., 'A Literary Source Book of the Renaissance'; Wolff, M., 'Lorenzo Valla: sein Leben und seine Werke.'

VIII. THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION AND HISTORIOGRAPHY.—Baur, F. C., 'Die Epochen der kirchlichen Geschichtsschreibung'; Beard, C., 'The Reformation of the Sixteenth Century in its Relation to Modern Thought and Knowledge'; Berger, A. E., 'Die Kulturaufgaben der Reformation'; Bury, J. B., 'A History of the Freedom of Thought' (Chap. IV-V); Calenzio, G., 'La vita e gli scritti del cardinale Cesare Baronio'; Floquet, A., 'Bossuet, précepteur du Dauphin'; Fueter, E., 'L'Histoire de l'Historiographie moderne' (Book III); Lang, A., 'John Knox and the Reformation'; McGiffert, A. C., 'Protestant Thought before Kant'; Maurenbrecher, W., 'Studien und Skizzen zur Geschichte der Reformationszeit'; Robinson, J. H., 'The Study of the Lutheran Revolt' (in *American Historical Review*, 1903); Schäfer, E., 'Luther als Kirchenhistoriker'; Schaumkell, F., 'Beiträge zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Magdeburger Centuries'; Smith, P., 'The Life and Letters of Martin Luther'; 'Luther's Correspondence and Other Contemporary Letters'; Weltz, P., 'Étude sur Sleidan.'

IX. THE FOUNDATIONS OF MODERN HISTORIOGRAPHY.—(1) *The Commercial Revolution and Historiography*.—Abbott, W. C., 'The Expansion of Europe'; Bourne, E. G., 'Spain in America'; Cunningham, W., 'Western Civilization in its Economic Aspects' (Book V); Fueter, E., 'L'Histoire de l'Historiographie moderne' (Book III); Hayes, C. J. H., 'A Political and Social History of Modern Europe' (Chap. II); MacNutt, F. A., 'Bartholomew de las Casas'; Merriman, R. B., 'The Rise of the Spanish Empire'; Moses, B., 'The Establishment of Spanish Rule in America'; Prescott, W. H., 'The Conquest of Mexico'; 'The Conquest of Peru' (Notes); Scignobos, C., 'Medieval and Modern Civilization' (Chap. XVII); Shepherd, W. R., 'Unpublished Lectures on the Expansion of Europe.'

2. *The Rise of Rationalism and Historiography*.—Benn, A. W., 'A History of English Rationalism in Nineteenth Century'; Brougham H. P., Robertson'; Bury, J. B., 'A History of the Freedom of Thought' (Chaps. VI-VII); Daisches, 'Das Verhältniss der Geschichtsschreibung Humes zu seiner praktischen Philosophie'; Delvaille, J., 'Essai sur l'histoire de l'idée de Progrès'; Fester, R., 'Rousseau und die deutsche Geschichtsphilosophie'; Flint, R.,

'The Philosophy of History in France and Germany'; 'The History of the Philosophy of History in France'; Fueter, E., 'L'Histoire de l'Historiographie moderne' (Book IV); Grundmann, J., 'Die geographischen und völkerkundlichen Quellen und Anschauungen in Herders Ideen'; Henking, K., 'Johannes von Müller'; Lecky, W. E. H., 'The Rise and Influence of Rationalism in Europe'; McGiffert, A. C., 'Protestant Thought before Kant' (Chap. X); Morley, J., 'Voltaire'; 'Rousseau'; 'Critical Miscellanies'; Morison, J. C., 'Gibbon'; Robertson, J. M., 'A Short History of Free Thought'; Sakmann, P., 'Die Probleme der historischen Methodik und der Geschichtsphilosophie bei Voltaire' (in *Historische Zeitschrift*, 1906); 'Voltaires Geistesart und Gedankenwelt'; Schüch, K., 'Studien über Johannes von Müller'; Sedgwick and Tyler, 'A Short History of Science' (Chaps. X-XIV); Seignobos, C., 'Contemporary Civilization' (Chap. III); Stephen, L., 'A History of English Thought in the Eighteenth Century'; Weber, G., 'Friedrich Christoph Schlosser.'

3. *Romanticism and Historiography*.—Barth, F., 'Die Geschichtsphilosophie Hegels'; Brandes, G., 'The Romantic School in Germany'; Dewey, J., 'German Philosophy and Politics'; Fester, R., 'Humboldt's und Rankes Ideenlehre'; Fueter, E., 'L'Histoire de l'Historiographie moderne' (Book V); Flint, R., 'The Philosophy of History in France and Germany'; Froude, J. A., 'Thomas Carlyle'; Harrison, F., 'Tennyson, Ruskin, Mill and Other Literary Estimates'; Holmes, O. W., 'Motley'; Juliani, C., 'Augustin Thierry' (in *Revue de synthèse historique*, 1906); Monod, G., 'Jules Michelet'; 'La place de Michelet parmi les historiens du XIX^e siècle'; Nichol, J., 'Thomas Carlyle'; Paul, H., 'The Life of Froude'; Robertson, J. M., 'Modern Humanists'; Roe, F. W., 'Carlyle as a Critic of Literature'; Vauthier, G., 'Villemain.'

4. *Nationalism and Historiography*.—Alt-schul, Charles, 'The American Revolution as Presented in Our School Text-Books'; Bardoux, A., 'Guizot'; Bassett, J. S., 'The Middle Group of American Historians'; Beard, C. A., 'An Introduction to the English Historians'; Burr, G. L., 'European Archives' (in *American Historical Review*, 1902); Charmes, X., 'La Comité des Travaux historiques'; Clark, J. S., 'The Life and Letters of John Fiske'; Crabb, J. A., 'Germany and England'; Davis, H. W. C., 'The Political Thought of Heinrich von Treitschke'; Droysen, G., 'Johann Gustav Droysen'; Dümmler, E., 'Über die Entstehung der Monumenta Germaniae'; Farnham, C. H., 'Life of Francis Parkman'; Fueter, E., 'L'Histoire de l'Historiographie moderne' (Books V-VI); Galley, J. B., 'Claude Fauriel'; Gooch, G. P., 'History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century' (Chap. V, VIII-XXII); Guérard, B., 'Notice sur Daunou'; Guilland, A., 'Modern Germany and Her Historians'; Hausrath, A., 'Treitschke'; Hayes, C. J. H., 'The War of the Nations' (in *Political Science Quarterly*, 1914); Hanotaux, G., 'Henri Martin'; Krehbiel, E., 'Nationalism, War and Society'; Marcks, E., 'Treitschke, ein Gedenkblatt'; 'Heidelberg Professoren'; Meinecke, F., 'Heinrich von Sybel' (in *Historische Zeitschrift*, 1895); Merriam, C. E., 'A History of American Political

Theories' (Chap. VII); Morison, J. C., 'Macauley'; Monod, G., 'Renan, Taine, Michelet'; Jameson, J. F., 'The History of Historical Writing in America'; 'Gaps in the Published Records of United States History' (in *American Historical Review*, 1906); Juliani, C., 'Extraits des Historiens français' (Introduction); Peck, H. T., 'W. H. Prescott'; Rein, A., 'Seeley, eine Studie über den Historiker'; Remusat, P., 'Thiers'; Robinson, J. H., 'What is National Spirit?' (in *Century Magazine*, 1916); Rose, J. H., 'Nationality in Modern History'; Simon, J., 'Quatre Portraits'; 'Thiers, Guizot, Remusat'; 'Mignet, Michelet, Henri Martin'; Sorel, A., 'Notes et Portraits'; Springer, A., 'F. C. Dahlmann'; Stephens, H. M., 'Modern Historians and their Influence on Small Nationalities' (in *Contemporary Review*, 1887); 'Nationality and History' (in *American Historical Review*, 1916); Stephens, W., 'The Life and Letters of Freeman'; Trevelyan, G. O., 'The Life and Letters of Macaulay'; Varrentrupp, C., 'Vorträge und Abhandlungen von Heinrich von Sybel'; Vinogradoff, P., 'Villainage in England' (Introduction).

5. *The Rise of Critical Historical Scholarship*.—Adams, G. B., 'Methods of Work in Historical Seminaries' (in *American Historical Review*, 1905); Adams, H. B., 'The Study of History in American Colleges and Universities'; Altamira, R., 'La Enseñanza de la Historia'; Bäumer, H., 'Mabillon'; Bernheim, E., 'Lehrbuch der historischen Methode' (Chaps. II-VI); Bourne, E. G., 'Ranke and the Beginning of the Seminary Method' (in *Essays in Historical Criticism*); Boutmy, E., 'A. Sorel'; Broglie, E. de, 'Mabillon et la société de l'abbaye de Saint-Germain-des-Prés à la fin du XVII^e siècle'; Cazenove, R. de, 'Rapin Thoyras'; Cazes, A., 'Pierre Bayle'; Channing, Hart and Turner, 'A Guide to the Study of American History'; Cipolla, C., 'Leibniz e Muratori'; Clasen, J., 'B. G. Niebuhr'; Dalberg-Acton, J. E. D., 'German Schools of History' (in *Historical Essays and Studies*); Davillé, L., 'Leibniz historien'; Dahlmann-Waitz, 'Quellenkunde der deutschen Geschichte'; Dilthey, K., 'Otfried Müller'; Frederick, P., 'The Study of History in England, Scotland, Belgium and Holland' (in *Johns Hopkins Studies in Historical and Political Science*, Vols. V-VIII); 'L'Enseignement supérieur de l'Histoire en Allemagne, France, Ecosse, Angleterre, Hollande et Belgique'; Fueter, E., 'L'Histoire de l'Historiographie moderne' (Books V-VI); Gooch, G. P., 'The Growth of Historical Science' (in 'Cambridge Modern History', Vol. XII, Chap. XXVI); 'History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century' (Chaps. I-IV, VI-VII, XII, XVIII, XXIII); Gross, C., 'The Sources and Literature of English History'; Guglia, E., 'Ranke's Leben und Werke'; Guiraud, P., 'Fustel de Coulanges'; Hall, G. Stanley (Editor), 'Methods of Teaching History' (2d ed.); Hartmann, L. M., 'Theodor Mommsen'; Haskins, C. H., 'Opportunities for American Students of History at Paris' (in *American Historical Review*, 1898); Hoffmann, M., 'August Böckh'; Jadart, 'Dom Jean Mabillon'; Langlois, C. V., 'Manuel de Bibliographie historique'; Langlois and Seignobos, 'Introduction to the Study of History' (Appendix II); 'Mélanges et Documents publiés à

l'occasion du deuxième centenaire de la mort de Mabillon'; Molinier, A., 'Les Sources de l'histoire de France'; Monod, G., 'Georg Waitz et le Séminaire historique de Goettingue'; 'Bibliographie de l'histoire de France'; Neumann, K. J., 'Entwicklung und Aufgaben der alten Geschichte'; Pattison, Mark, 'Essays'; Petit, E., 'Francois Mignet'; Pitra, Abbé, 'Études sur la collection des Actes des Saints'; Renan, E., 'Études d'histoire religieuse'; Ritter, M., 'Leopold von Ranke'; Rosenmund, R., 'Die Fortschritte der Diplomatik seit Mabillon'; Schulze, J. F., 'Karl Friedrich Eichorn'; Shotwell, J. T., 'The École des Chartes' (in *American Historical Review*, 1906); Stubbs, W., 'Lectures on Mediaeval and Modern History' (I-IV); Vincent, J. M., 'Historical Research'; White, A. D., 'European Schools of History and Politics' (in *Johns Hopkins Studies in Historical and Political Science*, Vol. V); Wyer, J. I., 'A Bibliography of the Study and Teaching of History.'

X. LEADING TENDENCIES IN MODERN HISTORIOGRAPHY.—Ashley, W. J., 'Surveys, Historic and Economic'; Barth, P., 'Die Philosophie der Geschichte als Sociologie'; Beaumont, G. de, 'Notices sur Tocqueville'; Bernheim, E., 'Lehrbuch der historischen methode' (Chap. I); Berr, H., 'La Synthèse en Histoire'; Boas, F., 'The Mind of Primitive Man' (Chaps. VI-VII); Bourne, H. E., 'The Teaching of History and Civics'; Bristol, L. M., 'Social Adaptation' (Chaps. IV-VI, VIII-IX); Bryce, J., 'Studies in Contemporary Biography'; Buckle, H. T., 'A History of Civilization in England' (Chap I); Caron and Sagnac, 'L'État actuel des Études d'Histoire moderne en France'; Coker, F. W., 'Organismic Theories of the State'; Conybeare, F. C., 'Myth, Magic and Morals'; 'A History of New Testament Criticism'; Cooley, C. H., 'Social Organization' (Part II); Davis, M., M., 'Psychological Interpretations of Society' (Chaps. II, VI-VIII, XIII); Duff, A., 'A History of Old Testament Criticism'; Dunning, W. A., 'A Generation of American Historiography' (Address before American Historical Association 1917); Ellwood, C. A., 'Sociology in its Psychological Aspects' (Chaps. II-III, VI-VII, XVIII-XIX); Firth, C. H., 'A Plea for the Historical Teaching of History'; Fisher, H. A. L., 'F. W. Maitland'; Friedrich, J., 'Ignatz von Döllinger'; Fueter, E., 'L'Histoire de l'Historiographie moderne' (Book VI); Gibbins, H. D. B., 'Economic and Industrial Progress of the Century'; Giddings, F. H., 'A Theory of Social Causation' (in *Publications of American Economic Association*, Vol. V); Gide and Rist, 'A History of Economic Doctrines'; Goldfriedrich, J., 'Die historische Ideenlehre im Deutschland'; Gooch, G. P., 'History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century' (Chaps. XXV-XXVIII); Haddon, A. C., 'A History of Anthropology'; Hankins, F. H., 'Adolphe Quetelet as Statistician'; Hayes, C. J. H., 'A Political and Social History of Modern Europe' (Vol. II, Chaps. XVIII, XXI, XXVII-XXVIII); Hazen, C. D., 'Europe Since 1815' (Chap. XXXII); Hecker, J. F., 'Russian Sociology' (Part II, Chap. IV, Part III, Chap. IV); Hohhouse, L. T., 'Social Evolution and Political Theory'; Huth, A. H., 'The

Life and Writings of Buckle'; Jacobs, P. J., 'German Sociology' (Chaps. II-III); Jodl, F., 'Die Kulturgeschichtsschreibung'; Lamprecht, K., 'What is History'; Mace, W. H., 'Method in History'; Macgregor, D. H., 'The Evolution of Industry'; Mackintosh, R., 'From Comte to Benjamin Kidd'; Merz, J. T., 'History of European Thought in the Nineteenth Century'; Michaelis, A., 'A Century of Archaeological Discoveries'; Oppenheimer, F., 'The State'; Robertson, J. M., 'Buckle and His Critics'; Robinson, J. H., 'The New History'; 'Outline of the History of the Intellectual Class in Western Europe'; Robinson and Beard, 'The Development of Modern Europe' (Vol. II, Chaps. XVIII, XXXI); Rogers, R. W., 'Cuneiform Parallels to the Old Testament'; Schapiro, J. S., 'Modern and Contemporary European History' (Chaps. III, XXIV-XXVI); Schaumkell, F., 'Geschichte der deutschen Kulturgeschichtsschreibung'; Seignobos, C., 'Contemporary Civilization' (Chaps. XIV-XIX); Seligmann, E. R. A., 'The Economic Interpretation of History'; Shotwell, J. T., 'The History of History: Texts and Commentary' (in preparation); Introduction to G. S. Slater's 'The Making of Modern England'; Introduction to N. D. Harris' 'Intervention and Colonization in Africa'; 'The Interpretation of History' (in *American Historical Review*, 1913); Small, A. W., 'The Meaning of Social Science'; Smith, A. L., 'F. W. Maitland, Two Lectures'; Sumner, W. G., 'Folkways' (Chap. I); Todd, A. J., 'Theories of Social Progress' (Chaps. IX, XIV-XV, XXVI-XXVII, XXXI); Tout, T. F., 'Schools of History' (in *University Review*, 1906); Wallace, A. R., 'The Progress of the Century'; 'The Wonderful Century.'

HARRY ELMER BARNES,
Associate Professor of History, Clark University.

HISTORY, Ancient. In the ordinary use of the word, history is a record of past events and conditions as determined by the processes of investigation included in historical method. The history of mankind treats not so much of individuals as of the progress and decline of communities and states with especial reference to morality, religion, intelligence, social organization, economic condition, refinement and taste, government, and the peaceful and military relations of governments to one another (cf. Andrews, 'Institutes of General History', p. 3). Strictly there are no periods; the life of mankind flows continuously, never wholly changing the direction of its current at any definite time. But for the convenience of study history is more or less arbitrarily divided into periods, during each of which the resultant of changes in the life of mankind, or of a particular part of it, is supposed to be a determinable movement of progress or decline which the historian takes as characteristic of the period.

The familiar division of general history into ancient, mediaeval, and modern may be accepted as the most practical, though it is exceedingly difficult to define these long and complex ages. Most obvious is the geographical characteristic. Leaving out of account India and the farther East, which have contributed little to the progress of the rest of the world, ancient history has to do (1) with the fertile

100% OF THE CURE ON THE

5

100% CURE 10 AM



008434378

**RETURN TO → CIRCULATION DEPARTMENT
202 Main Library**

LOAN PERIOD 1 HOME USE	2	3
4	5	6

ALL BOOKS MAY BE RECALLED AFTER 7 DAYS

Renewals and Recharges may be made 4 days prior to the due date.

Books may be Renewed by calling 642-3405.

DUE AS STAMPED BELOW

JAN 07 1991

FORM NO. DD6

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY
BERKELEY, CA 94720

